arXiv:1612.03233v1 [math.ST] 10 Dec 2016

NEW TESTS OF UNIFORMITY ON THE COMPACT CLASSICAL GROUPS AS DIAGNOSTICS FOR WEAK-* MIXING OF MARKOV CHAINS

By Amir Sepehri*

Stanford University

This paper introduces two new families of non-parametric tests of goodness-of-fit on the compact classical groups. One of them is a family of tests for the eigenvalue distribution induced by the uniform distribution, which is consistent against all fixed alternatives. The other is a family of tests for the uniform distribution on the entire group, which is again consistent against all fixed alternatives. We find the asymptotic distribution under the null and general alternatives. The tests are proved to be asymptotically admissible. Local power is derived and the global properties of the power function against local alternatives are explored.

The new tests are validated on two random walks for which the mixing-time is studied in the literature. The new tests, and several others, are applied to the Markov chain sampler proposed by Jones et al. [2011], providing strong evidence supporting the claim that the sampler mixes quickly.

1. Introduction. Recent work of Jones et al. [2011] suggested a Markov chain on the orthogonal group that is supposedly used to sample from the uniform distribution. They prescribe a particular number of steps after which the chain is mixed, resulting in a fast random rotation generator which is at the core of several successful randomized data analysis algorithms. Examples include approximate algorithms for highly over-determined linear regression, low-rank matrix approximation, and very high dimensional nearest neighbor analysis. Assuming that the chain mixes in the number of steps prescribed by the authors, this random rotation generator offers a significant speed up over the best known random rotation generators. In fact, the best exact algorithms for generating uniform orthogonal matrices, of dimension n, require order n^3 flops (see section 1.1). On the other hand, the new sampler applies a pseudo-random rotation to a single vector in $n \log n$ flops; it generates a

*Supported by a Weiland Graduate Fellowship in the School of Humanities and Sciences, Stanford University

62G10, 60B15, 62M15, 20C15

Keywords and phrases: Goodness-of-fit, Non-parametric hypothesis testing, Representation theory, Cauchy identity, Compact groups, Spectral analysis, Random rotation generators, Randomized approximate nearest neighbor analysis

full pseudo-random orthogonal matrix in $n^2 \log n$ flops (see section 1.4.2). In applications where multiplication of a random orthogonal matrix with many vectors is needed, the new sampler could offer a significant reduction in computational cost.

It is desirable to have outputs that are approximately uniformly distributed. This is not just a mere theoretical preference; it is a matter of practical importance. In fact, as discussed in Observation 1.1, the performance of the approximate nearest neighbor algorithm improves by using a uniform sampler compared to non-uniform samplers. Therefore, one needs to investigate the mixing properties of the new sampler. Unfortunately, due to complex construction of the new sampler, analytical study of the mixing-time seems to be hard. This paper suggests to numerically study the mixing-time of the new sampler using statistical tests of goodness-of-fit.

There is a sizable literature on goodness-of-fit testing on non-Euclidean spaces. Major work has been devoted to the development of goodness-of-fit tests on the circle and sphere (see Rayleigh [1880], Ajne [1968], Beran [1968], Watson [1961, 1962, 1967], Wellner [1979]). The literature on goodness-of-fit testing for the orthogonal group has been limited to three dimensions; two commonly used tests for three dimensional rotations are Downs' generalization of the Rayleigh test [Downs, 1972] and Prentice's generalization of Giné's G_n test [Prentice, 1978, Giné, 1975b]. For a more detailed review of the literature see Mardia and Jupp [2000]. In an important development in high dimensional setting, Coram and Diaconis [2003] proposed a family of statistical tests for the eigenvalue distribution induced from the Haar measure on the unitary group, $U(n)$. Their tests are relatively easy to compute and consistent against all fixed alternatives. One of the new tests in this paper was inspired by the tests of Coram and Diaconis [2003].

This paper settles the question about the mixing-time of the new sampler using statistical tests. Various known tests are applied (see sections 1.3, 1.4.2, and 2), confirming that the new sampler mixes quickly. New tests are introduced (see sections 3 and 4) and validated using the benchmark examples of section 1.2. The new tests are applied to the new sampler and the results are compared to other tests in section 5. The results are in agreement with the claim that the new sampler mixes quickly, i.e. after a given number of steps. Local properties, including local power, of the new tests are studied in section 6. Similar tests are stated for the other compact groups in section 7.

1.1. *Algorithms for generating uniform orthogonal matrices.* The following procedures are the most well-known algorithms for generating exactly

uniform random orthogonal matrices.

1. *Hurwitz's method.*
Hurwitz [1897] was the first to introduce the notion of the invariant measure on the orthogonal and unitary groups. He parameterized a rotation O in terms of the Euler angles and described the uniform measure in this parameterization. Let $R_j(\theta)$ denote a planar rotation with angle θ in the plane generated by the axis coordinates e_j, e_{j+1}. That is, the block diagonal matrix

$$R_j(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{j-1} & & & \\ & \cos\theta & \sin\theta & \\ & -\sin\theta & \cos\theta & \\ & & & I_{n-j-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, any $n \times n$ rotation $O \in SO(n)$ can be written as

$$O = E_1 E_2 \cdots E_{n-1},$$

where E_j is defined through

$$E_j = R_j(\theta_{j,j+1}) R_{j-1}(\theta_{j-1,j+1}) \cdots R_1(\theta_{1,j+1}), \tag{1}$$

with $0 < \theta_{1,j+1} < 2\pi$ and $0 \le \theta_{i,j+1} \le \pi$ for $2 \le i \le j \le n-1$. Moreover, O is uniformly distributed if and only if the Euler angles are independent random variables with density $f(\theta_{j,k}) \propto (\sin\theta_{j,k})^{j-1}$. In other words, $\cos\theta_{k,j}$ is distributed according to an explicit beta distribution. This suggests a simple algorithm to generate uniformly random rotations. The computational complexity of this algorithm for generating an $n \times n$ rotation is of order n^3. For a historical review of the work of Hurwitz and its influence on others see Diaconis and Forrester [2015].
2. *QR and polar decompositions of Gaussian matrices.*
Two other algorithms for generating uniformly random rotations can be constructed based on invariance properties of the multivariate Gaussian distribution and matrix decompositions. Let X be an $n \times n$ matrix whose entries are independent standard Gaussian variables. Let $X = Q \cdot R$ be the QR decomposition with $Q \in O(n)$ and R upper-triangular with non-negative diagonal entries. For a fixed rotation $M \in O(n)$, $M \cdot X$ has the same distribution as X because the multivariate Gaussian distribution is invariant under rotations. Since $MX = (MQ) \cdot R$ is the QR decomposition for MX, MQ has the same distribution as

Q. In other words, the distribution of Q is invariant under fixed rotations; thus, it is the uniform distribution on $O(n)$. This gives rise to an algorithm for generating uniformly random rotations as follows: generate a matrix X with independent Gaussian entries and let Q be the orthogonal part in the QR decomposition of X. The computational complexity of this algorithm is also of order n^3.
A similar algorithm can be constructed using the polar decomposition instead of the QR decomposition. The polar decomposition of a matrix X is $X = OP$ where O is an orthogonal matrix and P is symmetric positive-definite. Assuming X has independent Gaussian entries, the distribution of O will be invariant under fixed rotations, therefore the uniform distribution. The resulting algorithm requires order n^3 operations.

3. *The Subgroup Algorithm.*
The current state of the art algorithm for generating a uniformly random rotation is a recursive algorithm that exploits the fact that $O(n)$ includes a copy of $O(n-1)$, for example, the set of all orthogonal matrices fixing the 'north pole'. It works by choosing a random rotation that fixes the axis e_1, that is, a uniform element of $O(n-1)$, and multiplying it by a rotation that takes e_1 to a uniformly random point on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Formally,

$$O^{(n)} = (I - 2x^T x) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & O^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $O^{(n-1)} \in O(n-1)$ is uniformly distributed and $I - 2x^T x$ is the Householder reflection taking e_1 to a uniformly chosen point $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$; that is, $x = (e_1 - v)/\|e_1 - v\|$. This also gives an n^3 algorithm for generating a uniformly random rotation. For more details and history see Diaconis and Shahshahani [1987] and the references therein.

Roughly speaking, the new sampler introduced in Jones et al. [2011] is similar to Hurwitz's method in the sense that it multiplies independent copies of E_{n-1} defined in (1), interleaved with random rotations and a preconditioning Fourier kernel. The details of the sampler and the related application are described in section 1.4.

1.2. *Two benchmark examples.* The following two random walks on $O(n)$, for which the mixing-time is studied analytically, will be used to validate the tests of uniformity.

1. *Kac's random walk.*

Define the *elementary rotation* $R^{(i,j)}(\theta)$ as

$$R_{i,j}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \cos\theta & \cdots & -\sin\theta & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \sin\theta & \cdots & \cos\theta & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which differs from the identity matrix by four entries only with coordinates (i,i), (j,j), (i,j), and (j,i). The standard *Kac's random walk* $\{O_k\}$ on $SO(n)$ is the defined as follow:

$$O_{k+1} = R^{(k)}_{i,j}(\theta) O_k,$$

where $R^{(k)}_{i,j}(\theta)$ is an elementary rotation, with $\{i,j\}$ uniformly chosen among all pairs from $\{1,\dots,n\}$ and θ uniformly random in $[0,2\pi)$. This walk was introduced in Kac's effort to simplify Boltzmann's proof of the H-theorem [Kac, 1959] and Hastings's simulations of random rotations [Hastings, 1970]. Convergence of the Kac's random walk has been studied by various authors in different senses, In the current discussion, the focus is on convergence in Wasserstein distance which metrizes the weak convergence; for a review of literature see Pak and Sidenko [2007], Oliveira [2009], Pillai and Smith [2016]. The best known bound on the mixing-time in Wasserstein distance is obtained by Oliveira [2009], providing a bound of order $n^2 \log n$ on the mixing-time and proving that it is at most a factor $\log n$ away from optimal. This bounds will be a reference to compare the numerical results with in the rest of the paper.

2. *Iterative random reflections.*
As described in Diaconis [2003], the following random walk on $O(n)$ arose in a telephone encryption problem. At each step, the current orthogonal matrix is multiplied by a random reflection, a matrix of the form $I - 2u^T u$ for a uniform unit vector $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. This is similar to the Subgroup Algorithm since the Subgroup Algorithm multiplies n random reflection, with different dimension though.
The mixing-time for this chain has been studied carefully in Diaconis and Shahshahani [1986], Porod [1996], Rosenthal [1994], proving that $\frac{1}{2} n \log n + cn$ steps are necessary and sufficient for convergence of the

reflection walk to the uniform distribution in total variation distance. This random walk and its mixing-time properties will be used as a benchmark to evaluate performance of the new tests.

1.3. *A trace test.* It is a well-known fact due to Diaconis and Mallows [1986] that the trace of a uniformly distributed orthogonal matrix is approximately normally distributed, see Diaconis [1987]. One can use this fact to construct a test for uniformity as follows. Choose a uni-variate test of fit for the standard normal distribution. Given data $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in O(n)$, compute $\mathrm{tr}(g_1), \ldots, \mathrm{tr}(g_N)$ and apply your favorite test of normality to test if $\mathrm{tr}(g_i)$ is normally distributed.

We carried out the trace test on the Kac's random and the product of random reflections, aiming to numerically confirm the existing theory about the mixing-times.

First consider the Kac's walk. Results of Oliveira [2009] assert that the mixing time in Wasserstein distance is of order n^2, possibly multiplied by logarithmic factor. In each experiment, data consists of $N = 200$ observations of $n = 51$ dimensional rotation matrices based on different number of steps of the walk. The trace test is formally carried out by applying the chi-square test of normality and the Anderson-Darling test to the traces. The results are shown in Table 1. The mixing-time proposed by theory should be

TABLE 1. *p-values corresponding to Kac's walk*

# of steps	100	150	200	250	300	350	400	450	500
χ^2-test	$\ll$1e-15	$\ll$1e-15	2.06e-10	6.43e-05	6.94e-02	3.07e-01	2.36e-01	1.18e-01	6.18e-01
A-D test	$\ll$1e-06	$\ll$1e-06	8.35e-04	2.16e-02	2.87e-01	1.20e-01	8.19e-01	4.35e-01	7.66e-01

of order $n^2 = 2601$. However, the constant for the lower-bound is not known. The chi-square test shows that the Kac's walk does not mix before 250 steps. It suggests that the mixing might happen between 250 and 300 step. Note that no statistical test of goodness-of-fit can provide an upper-bound on the mixing time, because, if the null is not rejected it doesn't mean that the distribution is close to uniform. The Anderson-Darling test, however, suggests a weaker lower bound: it rejects the null hypothesis of uniformity until 200 steps of the walk, but not for 250 steps.

The trace test was tried also on the random walk generated by product of random reflections. The setup is the same; $N = 200$ and $n = 51$ for different number of steps. The result is presented in Table 2. Thanks to Diaconis and Shahshahani [1986], Porod [1996], Rosenthal [1994] it is known that the total-variation mixing time is of order $\frac{1}{2}n \log n + cn$. For $n = 51$, $\frac{1}{2}n \log n \approx 100$. The chi-square test clearly indicates that mixing does not happen until 100 steps of the walk, but it does not reject the null hypothesis

TABLE 2. *p-values corresponding to iterated random reflections*

# of steps	50	75	90	100	110	125	140	150	175	200
χ^2-test	$\ll$1e-15	$\ll$1e-15	$\ll$1e-15	1.29e-13	1.29e-01	6.14e-01	3.94e-02	7.46e-01	1.23e-02	4.07e-01
A-D test	$\ll$1e-06	$\ll$1e-06	$\ll$1e-06	$\ll$1e-06	$\ll$1e-06	3.00e-06	5.01e-03	5.34e-02	5.16e-02	7.44e-01

after 110 steps. Whereas, the Anderson-Darling test shows that the mixing does not happen until 140 steps and it might happen after around 150 steps. That roughly means that $c \geq 1$ in order for the chain to mix.



FIG 1. *Values of the Anderson-Darling statistic (left) and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic (right) versus the number of random reflections multiplied.*

1.4. *The new sampler.*

1.4.1. *Randomized Approximate Nearest Neighbor Analysis.* Jones et al. [2011] introduced several fast approximate numerical methods for solving fundamental problems in numerical analysis and linear algebra. Examples include approximate algorithms for highly over-determined linear regression, low-rank matrix approximation, and very high dimensional nearest neighbor analysis. All of these approximate algorithms are based on fast pseudo-random samplers that generate rotation or unitary matrices. The approximate algorithm for nearest neighbor analysis is detailed below.

Given N points $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and a positive integer k, the $k-$nearest neighbor problem asks for the list of the k nearest points to each of the points x_i. That is, to find a collection of sets A_i such that $|A_i| = k$ and A_i includes the k closest points to x_i among $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The naive algorithm proceeds as follows. Compute all the pairwise distances and for each i find the k points that have smallest distance to x_i, resulting in A_i. This is an $O(N^3kd)$ algorithm, which is computationally prohibitive for large N. To reduce the computational cost, Jones et al. [2011] suggested a randomized approximate algorithm; for each point x_i, instead of searching for the nearest neighbors among all other point, focus the search on a smaller set of *suspects*, A_i, that have high probability of being among the $k-$nearest neighbors of x_i.

Assuming A_i contains fraction α of all points and fraction β of the $k-$nearest neighbors, computational cost of the search for nearest neighbors is reduced by a multiplicative factor of approximately α/β, which can be substantial if $\alpha << \beta$. The algorithm is outlined below; for more details see Jones et al. [2011].

The set of suspects A_i is constructed as follows. First, shift all of the points to place their center of mass at the origin and apply a random orthogonal linear transformation on the resulting collection to get the set of points B. Divide all the points into two disjoint sets of roughly equal size; that is, let

$$B_- = \{x \in B \mid x(1) < m_1\} \quad B_+ = \{x \in B \mid x(1) \geq m_1\},$$

where m_1 is the median of the first coordinate and $x(i)$ is the $i-$th coordinate of the vector x. Let m_2 be the median of the second coordinate. Define

$$B_{+-} = \{x \in B_+ \mid x(2) < m_2\} \quad B_{++} = \{x \in B_+ \mid x(2) \geq m_2\}.$$

B_{-+} and B_{--} are defined similarly. Repeat the subdivision by splitting each of the four sets into two sets by using the median of the third coordinate. Proceed until there are 2^L sets B_σ with between k and $2k$ points in each set. The index σ is a word of symbols $+$ and $-$ of length L. For each point $x_i \in B_\sigma$ define

$$A_i = \{x \in B_\mu \mid \forall \mu; d(\sigma, \mu) \leq 1\}, \tag{2}$$

where $d(\sigma, \mu)$ is the number of places the words σ and μ disagree. For a fixed number T, repeat this process T times to construct the sets of suspects A_i^t for $i \leq N, t \leq T$. Finally, for each i let $A_i = \cup_t A_i^t$. The Algorithm 1 summarizes this.

ALGORITHM 1. *Randomized Approximate Nearest Neighbors Search*

Input: $x_i, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}$ and a positive integer k.
Output A collection of sets A_i consisting suspects for each point x_i.
1 Shift all the points to make origin the center of mass.
2 For $t = 1, \ldots, T$ repeat 3 through 5:
3 Choose a random orthogonal linear transformation Θ, and replace x_i with $\Theta(x_i)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$.
4 Construct 2^L boxes B_σ as described above.
5 For each x_i define the set A_i^t via (2).
6 Define $A_i = \cup_t A_i^t$.
7 Return $\{A_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, N\}$.

1.4.2. *Pseudorandom Orthogonal Transformations..* In high dimensional problems, i.e. when d is large, the Algorithm 1 can be slow because the computational cost of generating uniform random rotations is of order $O(d^3)$. Jones et al. [2011] propose a pseudorandom orthogonal matrix generator which is much faster. Their sampler generates a random rotation using $O(d^2 \log d)$ operations; in particular, the cost of applying it to any vector is only $O(d \log d)$. The new sampler proceeds by consecutively applying two dimensional rotations in coordinate planes, preconditioned using a Fourier type matrix. This is formally described below. Supposed d, M_1, M_2 are positive integers. Define a pseudorandom d-dimensional orthogonal transformation Θ as a composition of $M_1 + M_2 + 1$ orthogonal operators

$$\Theta = \left(\Pi_{i=1}^{M_1} Q_i \cdot P_i\right) \cdot F^d \cdot \left(\Pi_{j=2}^{M_2} Q_j P_j\right). \tag{3}$$

Each P_i is a uniformly distributed $d \times d$ permutation matrices, independent of others. That is, each P_i corresponds to a permutation p_i of $\{1, \ldots, d\}$ and P_i acts on vectors as follows

$$(P_i v)_j = v_{p_i(j)}.$$

Each Q_j is defined as

$$Q_j = Q_{d-1,j} \cdot Q_{d-2,j} \cdots Q_{1,j},$$

where $Q_{l,j}$ is a uniform two dimensional rotation in the plane generated by the l-th and $l+1$-th coordinates. That is, $(Q_{l,j} v)_i = v_i$ for $i \neq l, l+1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}(Q_{l,j} v)_l &= \cos\theta_{l,j} v_l + \sin\theta_{l,j} v_{l+1} \\ (Q_{l,j} v)_{l+1} &= -\sin\theta_{l,j} v_l + \cos\theta_{l,j} v_{l+1},\end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_{l,j}$ is a uniform number in $[0, 2\pi]$. Lastly, the linear operator F^d is defined as follows. Let $d_2 = \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$ and T be the following $d_2 \times d_2$ matrix:

$$T_{k,l} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_2}} \exp\left[-\frac{2\pi I (k-1)(l-1)}{d_2}\right].$$

Define $Z : \mathbb{R}^{2d_2} \to \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$ as

$$[Z(x)]_l = x_{2l-1} + i x_{2l}.$$

For d even, define F^d as

$$F^d = Z^{-1} \cdot T \cdot Z. \tag{4}$$

If d is odd, F^d fixes the last coordinate of x, and F^{d-1} defined in (4) is applied to the first $d-1$ coordinates. The cost of applying Θ to vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is of order $O(d(\log d + M_1 + M_2))$, because the cost of applying the operator F^d is $O(d \log d)$ and each operator $Q_j \cdot P_j$ costs $O(d)$. It is claimed in Jones et al. [2011] that if $M_1 + M_2 = O(\log d)$, then the distribution of Θ is close to the uniform distribution on the set of all $d \times d$ orthogonal matrices. This makes the new sampler much faster than the state of the art Subgroup Algorithm of Diaconis and Shahshahani [1987], which is an $O(d^3)$ algorithm for generating uniform $d \times d$ rotation matrices. However, it remain to be investigated whether the distribution of the output is close to the uniform distribution. This is not just a question of theoretical interest. Indeed, as explained below, it is of practical importance because the performance of the approximate nearest neighbor search is poorer when the distribution of the random rotations is not close to uniform.

OBSERVATION 1.1. *We carried out the approximate nearest neighbor search, described in Algorithm 1, for $N = 10^4$ data points and $k = 6$ nearest neighbors in dimension $d = 30$. T, the number of repetitions was set to 10. The nearest neighbor search was done with uniform rotations, the fast sampler, and a random rotation generator that is not similar to uniform. The non-uniform sampler was based on the QR decomposition of a matrix X with independent entries distributed according to $U[1, 2]$ instead of Gaussian distribution. It is not hard to numerically detect that this sampler is not uniform. For example, the trace does not behave similar to the uniform case; it appears to be normally distributed with a non-zero mean.*

The algorithms based on the uniform sampler and the new sampler outperformed the one using the non-uniform sampler by 5%. The results are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3. *Empirical percentage of true nearest neighbors discovered*

Sampler:	Uniform sampler	The new sampler	Non-uniform sampler
Percentage:	0.71	0.71	0.66

This suggest that in potential applications uniformity of the rotations might affect the performance of the method significantly.

Because of the complex construction of the new sampler, it is difficult to investigate the closeness to uniformity analytically. Therefore, we propose to investigate this question using statistical tests of goodness-of-fit. This motivates testing the following null hypothesis.

HYPOTHESIS 1.2 (The Null Hypothesis). *Given independent observations $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in O(n)$ from a distribution ν, the null hypothesis is*

$$H_0 : \nu = \textit{the uniform distribution.}$$

The trace test was applied to the new sampler of Jones et al. [2011]. For $n = 51$, they suggest that using $\log n \approx 3.93$ iterations suffices for convergence.



FIG 2. *Values of the Anderson-Darling statistic versus the number of iterations of the new sampler.*

Applying the trace test after only one iteration does not reject the null hypothesis and there is no evidence of departure from the null. The values of the Anderson-Darling statistic are plotted in Figure 2, for different number of iterations of the new sampler. The normal QQ-plot of the traces after a single iteration is illustrated in Figure 3 and the p-values for the chi-square and Anderson-Darling tests are shown in Table 4.

2. Some Already Known Tests. Two important tests for uniformity on $SO(3)$, the Rayleigh's test and the Gine's test, are reviewed in this section. The application to the examples of the previous section is demonstrated.



FIG 3. *Normal QQ-plot of the trace for the new sampler*

# of steps	1	2
χ^2-test	0.58	0.87
A-D test	0.66	0.79

TABLE 4. *The p-values for the new sampler*

2.1. *Rayleigh's test.* Perhaps the first test of uniformity on $SO(3)$ was introduced by Rayleigh [1880]. Given data $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in SO(3)$ define

$$T_R = nN \operatorname{tr}(\bar{g}^T \bar{g}),$$

where

$$\bar{g} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} g_i.$$

The Rayleigh's test for uniformity rejects for large values of T_R. This can be directly generalized to the higher dimensional case. The Rayleigh's test was applied to the benchmark examples of the previous section. Again, the sample size is $N = 200$ and the dimension is $n = 51$. Each test statistic was computed on 1000 independent repetitions. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate the histogram of the Rayleigh's statistics for the product of random reflections and Kac's walk, respectively, with that corresponding to the uniform distribution overlaid.

The Rayleigh's test seems to be less powerful than the trace test on both examples. In particular, the trace test rejects the null hypothesis of uniformity for products of 100 random reflection, whereas, the Rayleigh's test fails to reject the null hypothesis even after 75 steps. Recall that the trace test only used a sample of size 200; on the other hand, the Rayleigh's statistics is computed on 1000 independent samples each of size 200. The Anderson-Darling p-value for the 1000 values of the Rayleigh's statistic after different number of steps are given in Table 5.



FIG 4. *Histogram of Rayleigh's statistic for uniform random orthogonal matrices (blue) overlays the histogram of Rayleigh's statistic (red) for: the product of 50 random reflections (left) and 75 random reflections (right).*



FIG 5. *Histogram of Rayleigh's statistic for uniform random orthogonal matrices (blue) overlays the histogram of Rayleigh's statistic (red) for: the Kac's walk after 150 steps (left) and after 250 steps (right).*

TABLE 5. *p-values corresponding to Rayleigh's test on iterated random reflections*

# of steps	50	75	90	100	110	125	140	150	175	200
A-D test	$\ll$1e-15	0.03	0.16	0.17	0.08	0.63	0.20	0.37	0.29	0.01

Similarly, for the Kac's walk the trace test rejects the null hypothesis for 250 steps of the walk, whereas the Rayleigh's test does not. The p-values are given in Table 6.

TABLE 6. *p-values corresponding to Rayleigh's test on Kac's walk*

# of steps	100	150	200	250	300	350	400	450	500
A-D test	$\ll$1e-32	$\ll$1e-32	1.46e-32	6.80e-01	6.31e-01	6.08e-01	8.84e-01	4.74e-01	2.95e-02

Applying Rayleigh's test to samples generated by the new sampler of Jones et al. [2011] provides no evidence for departure from uniformity. The p-value of the Anderson-Darling test based on 1000 values of the Rayleigh's statistic computed on samples of size 200 is 0.35 after only one iteration.

2.2. *Gine's test.* Another important test of uniformity on $SO(3)$ was introduced by Giné [1975b]. Given data $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in SO(3)$, define

$$T_G = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(I - g_i^T g_j)}.$$

Gine's test rejects for large values of T_G and is consistent against all fixed alternatives on $SO(3)$. This is not the case for any dimension higher than three. However, T_G can be computed for matrices of all dimensions. The corresponding test was carried out on the Kac's walk, the product of random reflections, and the new sampler. Gine's tests seems to be more powerful than the Rayleigh's test and less powerful than the trace test on these examples. Histograms of the values of the Gine's statistic are illustrated in Figures 6 and 7. The histograms are based on 1000 Monte Carlo simulation of the test statistic based on samples of size 200 in 51 dimensions.



FIG 6. *Histogram of Gine's statistic for uniform random orthogonal matrices (blue) overlays the histogram of Gine's statistic (red) for: product of 110 random reflections (left) and 125 random reflections (right).*

Applying the Gine's test to the new sampler provides no evidence for departure from the null. The Anderson-Darling p-values after one and two iterations of the sampler are 0.58 and 0.45, respectively.



FIG 7. *Histogram of Gine's statistic for uniform random orthogonal matrices (blue) overlays the histogram of Gine's statistic (red) for: the Kac's walk after 100 steps (left) and 150 steps (right).*

3. Tests Based on Eigenvalues. The new sampler has passed all the tests considered in the previous sections. In this section, various new tests based on the eigenvalues are introduced and applied to the benchmark examples as well as the new sampler.

3.1. *A test based on exponential families.* The joint density of the eigenvalues of a uniformly random rotation matrix of odd dimension, $g \in SO(2n+1)$, is given by Weyl [Weyl, 1946, page 224] as

$$f(e^{\pm i\theta_1}, \ldots, e^{\pm i\theta_n}) \propto \prod_i \sin^2(\frac{\theta_i}{2}) \prod_{i<j} |\cos\theta_i - \cos\theta_j|^2, \tag{5}$$

where $(1, e^{\pm i\theta_1}, \ldots, e^{\pm i\theta_n})$ are eigenvalues of g. By a change of variables $x_i = \cos\theta_i$, the density, in terms of $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in [-1, 1]^n$, becomes

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \propto \prod_{i<j} |x_i - x_j|^2 \prod_i \frac{\sqrt{1-x_i}}{\sqrt{1+x_i}}. \tag{6}$$

The density f can be embedded in the following exponential family:

$$f_{\gamma,\alpha,\beta}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \propto \prod_{i<j} |x_i - x_j|^{2\gamma} \prod_i (1-x_i)^{\alpha-1}(1+x_i)^{\beta-1}. \tag{7}$$

The normalizing constant is given by Selberg's integral [Mehta, 2004, pg. 320, eqn. (17.5.9)] as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{[-1,1]^n} \prod_{i<j} |x_i - x_j|^{2\gamma} \prod_i (1-x_i)^{\alpha-1}(1+x_i)^{\beta-1} dx_1 \ldots dx_n \\ &= 2^{\gamma n(n-1)+n(\alpha+\beta-1)} \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\Gamma(1+\gamma+j\gamma)\Gamma(\alpha+j\gamma)\Gamma(\beta+j\gamma)}{\Gamma(1+\gamma)\Gamma(\alpha+\beta+\gamma(n+j-1))}. \end{aligned}$$

The density (6) is the special case of (7) for $\gamma_0 = 1$, $\alpha_0 = 3/2$, and $\beta_0 = 1/2$. We abuse the notation to denote by $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$ both densities (5) and (6). Recall that the eigenvalues of a uniform orthogonal matrix g are placed quite regularly on the unit circle. For example, the trace of g is approximately normal; whereas, for uniformly distributed points on the unit circle, say in conjugate pairs, the magnitude of the sum is of order $O(\sqrt{n})$. The family of densities $f_{\gamma,\alpha,\beta}$ models the regularity of the configuration of the points on the circle. The case of $\gamma = 0, \alpha = \beta = 1/2$ of (7) corresponds to θ_i being independent uniform on $[0, \pi]$. As γ tends to infinity the points $e^{i\theta_j}$ become evenly placed on the semicircle. This is illustrated in Figure 8.



FIG 8. *left: 25 uniform points on the circle and their conjugates, middle: eigenvalues of a uniform* 51×51 *orthogonal matrix, right: 51 evenly placed points on the circle.*

Testing for the Haar measure in this parametric family translates to

$$H_0 : (\gamma, \alpha, \beta) = (\gamma_0, \alpha_0, \beta_0) \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : (\gamma, \alpha, \beta) \neq (\gamma_0, \alpha_0, \beta_0). \tag{8}$$

Unfortunately, there is no uniformly most powerful test available in this setting. However, the problem fits into the framework of Asymptotically Normal Experiments Le Cam. This allows for construction of an asymptotically *maximin* optimal test as follows. Define $T_1(x) = 2\sum_{i<j} \log|x_i - x_j|$, $T_2(x) = \sum_i \log(1 - x_i)$, and $T_3(x) = \sum_i \log(1 + x_i)$. Then (T_1, T_2, T_3) is a sufficient statistic for the exponential family $f_{\gamma,\alpha,\beta}$. That is,

$$f_{\gamma,\alpha,\beta}(x) = \exp\left(\gamma T_1(x) + (\alpha - 1)T_2(x) + (\beta - 1)T_3(x) - \mathcal{A}(\gamma, \alpha, \beta)\right),$$

where $\mathcal{A}(\gamma, \alpha, \beta) = \log\left(2^{\gamma n(n-1)+n(\alpha+\beta-1)} \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\Gamma(1+\gamma+j\gamma)\Gamma(\alpha+j\gamma)\Gamma(\beta+j\gamma)}{\Gamma(1+\gamma)\Gamma(\alpha+\beta+\gamma(n+j-1))}\right)$. Then, given data $x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(N)}$ the likelihood is

$$\prod_m f_{\gamma,\alpha,\beta}(x^{(m)}) = \exp\left(\gamma T_1^{(N)} + (\alpha - 1)T_2^{(N)} + (\beta - 1)T_3^{(N)} - N\mathcal{A}(\gamma, \alpha, \beta)\right),$$

where $T_i^{(N)} = \sum_m T_i(x^{(m)})$. By standard asymptotic theory, under the null, $T^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N}(T_1^{(N)}, T_2^{(N)}, T_3^{(N)})$ is approximately normal with mean $\mu = \nabla\mathcal{A}(\gamma_0, \alpha_0, \beta_0)$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma = \nabla^2\mathcal{A}(\gamma_0, \alpha_0, \beta_0)/N$. The test that rejects for large values of

$$T = (T^{(N)} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (T^{(N)} - \mu)$$

is asymptotically maximin optimal [Lehmann and Romano, 2006, Theorem 13.5.5]. Moreover, μ and Σ can be computed using the recurrence relations and series expansions for digamma and trigamma functions [Abramowitz

and Stegun, 1964, pp 258-259]. For 51×51 orthogonal matrices, $n = 25$, and $(\gamma_0, \alpha_0, \beta_0) = (1, 3/2, 1/2)$ they are

$$\mu \approx (-329.70, -14.73, -19.92),$$

$$\Sigma \approx \begin{bmatrix} 5.67712 \times 10^{-2} & -1.40363 \times 10^{-2} & -3.61067 \times 10^{-4} \\ -1.40363 \times 10^{-2} & 1.52093 \times 10^{-2} & -3.46523 \times 10^{-3} \\ -3.61067 \times 10^{-4} & -3.46523 \times 10^{-3} & 3.96834 \times 10^{-2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We applied this test on two samples of size $N = 200$ and 1000; data was generated using only one step of the pseudorandom sampler (3) of section 1.4.2. The test statistic T evaluated to 3.84 and 1.34, respectively. Under the null, T is approximately χ^2_3 distributed. The corresponding p-values are 0.72 and 0.28, respectively; it provides no evidence for departure from uniformity.

To further explore the performance of T, it was applied to the benchmark examples. Tables 7 and 8 show the p-values corresponding to T applied to samples of size N of 51×51 orthogonal matrices generated by product of k random reflections and k steps of the Kac's walk, respectively. The p-values suggest that T detects the cut-off to some extent. The numerical experiments of this section witness the claim that the sampler (3) indeed mixes quickly.

TABLE 7. *p-values corresponding to product of random reflections*

$k =$	100	125	130	135	140	150
$N = 200$	0	0.0002	0.001	0.055	0.09	0.20
$N = 1000$	0	0	0	0.0001	0.03	0.42

TABLE 8. *p-values corresponding to Kac's walk*

$k =$	150	200	225	240	250	300
$N = 200$	0	0	0.001	0.004	0.19	0.40
$N = 1000$	0	0	0	0	0.00001	0.65

3.2. *A family of consistent tests for* $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$. Given data $x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(N)}$ in $[-1, 1]^n$, this section introduces a family of tests $T_z^{(N)}(x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(N)})$, for $0 < z < 1$, that are invariant under the natural symmetries of $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$ and are consistent against all alternatives. The asymptotic distributions under null and alternative are also available. A high level description of the methods of this section for a general hypothesis testing problem are given in the following section. It is then carried out for $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$.

3.2.1. *Spectral tests on general spaces.* Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Polish space and μ a probability measure on $\mathcal{X}$. Consider the standard non-parametric goodness-of-fit testing problem: given independent and identically distributed observations $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathcal{X}$ from a probability measure ν on $\mathcal{X}$, test if $\nu = \mu$. A general test based on spectral techniques can be constructed as follows. Let $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{X}, \mu)$ be the space of square μ-integrable functions on $\mathcal{X}$. Assume that $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{X}, \mu)$ is separable with a countable orthonormal basis $\{f_i \mid i \geq 0\}$, with $f_0 = 1$. For example, it suffices to assume that $\mathcal{X}$ is compact. Define the empirical measure of $\{x_i\}$ as $\nu_N = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{x_i}$, and the Fourier coefficients of ν_N as

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\nu}_N(i) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} f_i(x)\nu_N(dx) \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} f_i(x_n).\end{aligned}$$

Then, under the null, $\widehat{\nu}_N(i) \to 0$ as n grows to infinity, for $i > 0$. This property characterizes μ; that is, if $x_1, x_2, \ldots \in \mathcal{X}$ are i.i.d. draws from ν and $\widehat{\nu}_N(i) \to 0$ for all $i > 0$ then, $\mu = \nu$. This property can be used to construct tests of fit for μ. By the central limit theorem

$$\sqrt{N}\widehat{\nu}_N(i) \to \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Thus, $N|\widehat{\nu}_N(i)|^2$ is asymptotically χ^2_1 distributed. For a sequence of weights $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, c_2, \ldots)$, define

$$T_{\boldsymbol{c}} = N\sum_i c_i|\widehat{\nu}_N(i)|^2.$$

Assuming that $T_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ converges to a finite value, a test that rejects for large values of $T_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ can be used for testing $H_0 : \nu = \mu$. Many well-known classical tests can be constructed in this manner. The most important example is the celebrated Neyman's smooth test for uniformity on the unit interval. Neyman's test uses Legendre polynomials as the orthonormal basis. Under mild conditions and the assumption $c_i > 0$ the test based on $T_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ is consistent against all alternatives, and has various desired statistical properties. There is a vast literature on properties of tests of this form; we do not attempt to review the literature since it is considered classical nowadays.

There are two main challenges in using the above machinery in a general problem: 1) finding an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}^2$, 2) computing $T_{\boldsymbol{c}}$. In his celebrated paper, Giné [1975b] gave a solution for the first challenge

for the testing problem with μ being the invariant measure on a compact Riemannian manifold M; this is sketched below.

Let Δ be the Laplace-Beltrami operator (Laplacian) of M acting on the space of Schwartz functions by duality. Denote by E_k the k-th invariant eigenspace of Δ with eigenvalue σ_k. Let $\{f_i^k\}_{i=0}^{\dim E_k}$ be an orthonormal basis for E_k. Then, $\{f_i^k \mid k \geq 0,\ 1 \leq i \leq \dim E_k\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}^2(M, \mu)$. Note that the hypothesis testing problem

$$H_0 : \nu = \mu \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : \nu \neq \mu$$

is invariant under natural symmetries of M. Therefore, by the Hunt-Stein theorem [Lehmann and Romano, 2006, page 331] one only needs to consider invariant tests. Giné [1975b] suggested the test, called Sobolev test, based on

$$T_N^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = N \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k \sum_{f_i \in E_k} \left[\int_M f_i \, d\nu_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \right]^2,$$

for a sequence of weights $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots)$ such that $\sup |\alpha_k \sigma_k^s| < \infty$ for some $s > \frac{1}{2} \dim M$. Note that the weights depend only on the eigenspaces; this ensures that the test is invariant. Giné [1975b] studied statistical properties of the Sobolev tests; he derived the null and alternative distribution and investigated local optimality properties following Beran [1968].

Although these tests have been successful in practice, usually substantial non-trivial work is required to carry out the details for any particular example of interest. Giné [1975b] carried out the program for the circle, sphere, and the projective plane, recovering many known examples in the literature and introducing new tests of uniformity. Several authors have studied and derived Sobolev tests for different examples including circular and directional data, tests of symmetry, and unitary eigenvalues; see Prentice [1978], Wellner [1979], Jupp and Spurr [1983, 1985], Hermans and Rasson [1985], Baringhaus [1991], Sengupta and Pal [2001], Coram and Diaconis [2003].

Regarding the second challenge, Giné [1975a,b] suggested partial answers for the Sobolev tests, based on Zonal functions. His suggestion results in an alternative expression for $T_N^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ in the form of an infinite series, which is simpler than the original definition. However, there still remains the challenge to find a closed form for $T_N^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, or to compute it effectively, in general.

Construction of a family of invariant tests for $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$ based on ideas detailed above requires finding an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}^2([-1,1]^n, f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})$. This can be constructed using the representation theory of the special orthogonal group $SO(2n+1)$. A brief introduction is given below. For a textbook treatment see Bump [2004], Goodman and Wallach [2009].

3.2.2. *Background on representation theory of Lie groups.* Let G be the group $SO(2n+1)$. A representation π of G on a vector space V, denoted by (π, V), is a map $\pi : G \to End(V)$ that preserves multiplication. That is, $\pi(g)$ is a linear operator on V for any $g \in G$, and for all $g, h \in G$

$$\pi(g \cdot h) = \pi(g)\pi(h).$$

This is just an embedding of the group G into space of linear maps on V such that the group multiplication corresponds to composition of linear maps, i.e. to matrix multiplication.

A representation is called reducible if $\pi(g)$ can be decomposed in a block-diagonal form

$$\pi(g) = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_1(g) & 0 \\ 0 & \pi_2(g) \end{bmatrix},$$

for maps π_1, π_2 and all g. It is called *irreducible* if it is not reducible. For a compact Lie group G, for $SO(2n+1)$ in particular, there are countably many non-equivalent irreducible representations. Moreover, they can be assumed to be unitary in the sense that $\pi(g)$ is a unitary matrix for all g. All the representations appearing in this paper are assumed to be unitary.

The character corresponding to a representation (π, V) is defined as

$$\chi(g) = \mathrm{tr}(\pi(g)).$$

Characters are invariant under conjugation: $\chi(g) = \chi(h^{-1}gh)$ for all $g, h \in G$. Two elements g and h are conjugate if and only if they have the same eigenvalues. Therefore, $\chi(g)$ is a symmetric function of the eigenvalues of g. The characters characterize the representations in the sense that if $\chi_\pi = \chi_\rho$ for two representations π and ρ, then $\pi = \rho$. The characters corresponding to irreducible representations are called *irreducible characters*. A function on G is called a class function if it is invariant under conjugation. Let $\mathcal{L}^2_{class}(G)$ be the space of square-integrable class functions on G. The following theorems are of fundamental importance (see [Bump, 2004, ch. 4]).

PROPOSITION 3.1 (The Peter-Weyl theorem). *Let $\{(\pi^\lambda, V^\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{I}\}$ be the set of all distinct irreducible representations of G. Let $d_\lambda = \dim V^\lambda$, and π^λ_{ij} be the (i,j)-th coordinate of π^λ. Then, $\{\sqrt{d_\lambda}\pi^\lambda_{ij} \mid i, j \le d_\lambda,\ \lambda \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}^2(G)$.*

PROPOSITION 3.2 (The Peter-Weyl theorem for characters). *The irreducible characters of G form an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}^2_{class}(G)$.*

The irreducible representations of $SO(2n+1)$ are labeled by partitions of arbitrary non-negative integers with at most n parts. For such a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k)$ the irreducible character corresponding to λ is given by the Weyl character formula [Bump, 2004, ch. 22] as

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_\lambda(g) &= \frac{\det\left[e^{i\theta_k(\lambda_l+n-l+\frac{1}{2})} - e^{-i\theta_k(\lambda_l+n-l+\frac{1}{2})}\right]_{k,l}}{\det\left[e^{i\theta_k(n-l+\frac{1}{2})} - e^{-i\theta_k(n-l+\frac{1}{2})}\right]_{k,l}} \\ &= \frac{\det\left[\sin\left(\theta_k(\lambda_l+n-l+\frac{1}{2})\right)\right]_{k,l}}{\det\left[\sin\left(\theta_k(n-l+\frac{1}{2})\right)\right]_{k,l}},\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $1, e^{\pm i\theta_1}, \ldots, e^{\pm i\theta_n}$ are the eigenvalues of g. For a textbook exposition to Fourier analysis and connections to probability measures on Lie groups see Applebaum and Heyer [2014]. We conclude this section with a remark on the connection between the characters and multivariate orthogonal polynomials.

REMARK 3.3. *The irreducible characters of $SO(2n+1)$, written in terms of the real parts of the eigenvalues, correspond to the Jacobi orthogonal polynomials with respect to $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$, namely $\{P_\lambda^{1/2,-1/2}\}$. See, for example, Olshanski and Osinenko [2012].*

3.2.3. *Spectral tests for $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$.* With access to an orthonormal basis $\{\chi_\lambda\}$ for $\mathcal{L}^2_{class}$ one can construct a test for $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$ using the machinery of section 3.2.1. Given independent observations $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in SO(2n+1)$, define the Fourier coefficient corresponding to λ as

$$\widehat{\chi}_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \chi_\lambda(g_i).$$

For $0 < z < 1$ define the test statistics $T_z^{(N)}$ as

$$T_z^{(N)} = N \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} \left|\widehat{\chi}_N(\lambda)\right|^2. \tag{10}$$

In order to use $T_z^{(N)}$ in practice, one needs to find a way to actually compute $T_z^{(N)}$; a closed form expression is constructed below. Expand each summand on the right hand side of (10) and change the order of summation

to get

$$T_z^{(N)} = N \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \chi_\lambda(g_i) \right|^2$$
$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \chi_\lambda(g_i)\chi_\lambda(g_j)$$
$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} \chi_\lambda(g_i)\chi_\lambda(g_j).$$

Therefore, a closed for expression for

$$K_z(g_i, g_j) \doteq \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} \chi_\lambda(g_i)\chi_\lambda(g_j)$$

would yield a closed form expression for $T_z^{(N)}$.

A closed form expression for $K_z(g, h)$ was already available in the literature for the case of the unitary group $U(n)$ through the Cauchy identity for the Schur functions. Motivated by study of zeros of the Riemann zeta function, Coram and Diaconis [2003] used the Cauchy identity of Schur functions and the connection between the Schur function and the irreducible characters of the unitary group to build a test for the eigenvalue distribution induced by the Haar measure on the unitary group. The test statistic $T_z^{(N)}$ is an analogue for the orthogonal group of the test of Coram and Diaconis [2003].

In the case of the orthogonal group there was no closed form for K_z available in the literature. Motivated by the testing problem under study in the present paper, the author derived Cauchy identities for all the compact classical groups. The Cauchy identity for the orthogonal group is given in the next proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.4 (Cauchy identity for $SO(2n+1)$, Theorem 3.1 in Sepehri). *Let $g, h \in SO(2n+1)$ have eigenvalues equal to $(1, e^{\pm i\theta_1}, \ldots, e^{\pm i\theta_n})$ and $(1, e^{\pm i\phi_1}, \ldots, e^{\pm i\phi_n})$, respectively. Then,*

(11)
$$K_z(g, h) = \frac{(1-z)^n \det\left[\frac{(1+z)^2+2z(\cos\theta_k+\cos\phi_l)}{(1+z^2)^2-4(z+z^3)\cos\theta_k\cos\phi_l+2z^2(\cos 2\theta_k+\cos 2\phi_l)}\right]_{k,l}}{(4z)^{\binom{n}{2}} \prod_{i<j}(\cos\theta_i - \cos\theta_j) \prod_{i<j}(\cos\phi_i - \cos\phi_j)} - 1.$$

Despite the complicated appearance of the formula (11), it is relatively easy to compute if the dimension is not too large. Using this formula, the test statistic can be more explicitly defined as follows.

DEFINITION 3.5. *For $z \in (0,1)$ and observations $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in SO(2n+1)$ define the test statistic as*

$$T_z^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} K_z(g_i, g_j). \tag{12}$$

The test based on $T_z^{(N)}$ was applied to the benchmark examples and the new sampler. It is indeed more powerful than all tests considered in the previous section on both the Kac's walk and the product of random reflections. Figure 9 illustrates the histogram of the values of $T_z^{(N)}$ based on 1000 Monte Carlo simulations of the statistic on samples of size $N = 200$ in dimension 51. The alternatives are products of 140 and 150 random reflections respectively. The 5%-level test based on $T_{1/2}^{(200)}$ has power equal to 0.64 against the product of 140 random rotations; the power drops to 0.30 against the product of 150 random rotations.



FIG 9. *Histogram of $T_z^{(N)}$ under the null (blue) and alternative (red) with $N = 200$, $n = 25$, and $z = 0.5$, based on 1000 Monte Carlo runs. The alternatives are the distributions of the product of 140 random reflections (left) and 150 random reflections (right).*

REMARK 3.6. *The test statistic $T_z^{(N)}$ has, by construction, a decomposition to approximately independent parts. When the test reject the null hypothesis, it would be instructive to see which of the components is larger than its typical values. Such an analysis is illuminating regarding the nature of the departure from uniformity. This was investigated using not exactly the components given in the definition of $T_z^{(N)}$, but a few components that are*

simpler to compute. For $k = 1, \ldots, 5$*, the quantity*

$$C_k^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathrm{tr}(g_i^k)$$

was computed for 1000 samples of size 200 each generated by product of random reflections and the uniform sampler. The results were compared using the Anderson-Darling test and the test statistic is shown in Figure 10 for $T_z^{(N)}$ *and* C_k*,* $k = 1, \ldots, 5$*. As can be seen, the component corresponding to* $\mathrm{tr}(g^2)$ *is the most significant in this examples. In fact, it exhibits slightly higher power compared to* $T_z^{(N)}$*.*



FIG 10. *Values of the Anderson-Darling statistic for comparison of the uniform sample and the product of random reflections based on:* $T_z^{(N)}$ *(top left),* $\mathrm{tr}(g)$ *(top right),* $\mathrm{tr}(g^2)$ *(middle left),* $\mathrm{tr}(g^3)$ *(middle right),* $\mathrm{tr}(g^4)$ *(bottom left),* $\mathrm{tr}(g^5)$ *(bottom right).*

Figure 11 illustrates the histogram of the values of $T_z^{(N)}$ based on 1000 Monte Carlo simulations of the statistic on samples of size $N = 200$ in

dimension 51. The alternatives are output of the Kac's walk after 250 and 300 steps, respectively. The 5%-level test based on $T_{1/2}^{(200)}$ against the Kac's walk has power equal to 0.93 against alternative distribution of Kac's walk after 250 steps. The power drops to 0.25 after 300 steps.



FIG 11. *Histogram of $T_z^{(N)}$ under the null (blue) and alternative (red) with $N = 200$, $n = 25$, $z = 0.5$, and 1000 Monte Carlo runs. The alternatives are the distributions of the Kac's random walk after 250 steps (left) and 300 steps (right).*

REMARK 3.7. *Considering a few low order components of the test statistic under the Kac's alternative is instructive. For $k = 1, \ldots, 5$, the quantity*

$$C_k^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathrm{tr}(g_i^k)$$

was computed for 1000 samples of size 200 each generated by the Kac's walk and the uniform sampler. The results were compared using the Anderson-Darling test and the test statistic is shown in Figure 12 for $T_z^{(N)}$ and C_k, $k = 1, \ldots, 5$. In this example, the component corresponding to $\mathrm{tr}(g^3)$ is the most significant. It captures the cutoff more clearly compared to $T_z^{(N)}$.

The test based on $T_{1/2}^{(200)}$ applied to the new sampler, after a single iteration, provides no evidence for departure from the null. The Anderson-Darling p-value based on 1000 values of $T_{1/2}^{(200)}$ is equal to 0.35 after only one iteration of the sampler.

3.2.4. *Distribution under the null hypothesis.* The representation (10) allows for derivation of the distribution under the null hypothesis of uniformity. This is the content of the next proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.8. *Assume $g_1, \ldots, g_N$ are independent draws from the uniform distribution on $SO(2n+1)$, and $T_z^{(N)}$ is defined as in (10). Then,*



FIG 12. *Values of the Anderson-Darling statistic for comparison of the uniform sample and the Kac's walk based on:* $T_z^{(N)}$ *(top left),* $\mathrm{tr}(g)$ *(top right),* $\mathrm{tr}(g^2)$ *(middle left),* $\mathrm{tr}(g^3)$ *(middle right),* $\mathrm{tr}(g^4)$ *(bottom left),* $\mathrm{tr}(g^5)$ *(bottom right).*

for any $z \in (0,1)$ *one has*

$$T_z^{(N)} \to T_z = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} z^k \chi^2_{p(n,k)} \quad (as\ N \to \infty).$$

On the right hand side, p(n,k) is the number of partitions of k with at most n parts and random variables $\chi^2_{p(n,k)}$ *are chi-square with* $p(n,k)$ *degrees of freedom which are mutually independent.*

PROOF. The CLT along with the orthogonality relations between the irreducible characters assert that $\sqrt{N}\widehat{\chi}_N(\lambda)$ converges to standard Gaussian variables for $\lambda \neq 0$, and the limiting variables are mutually independent . This mean that $N|\widehat{\chi}_N(\lambda)|^2$ converges weakly to a χ^2_1 random variable. Collecting powers of z in (10) and using the independence of limiting variables

prove the proposition. □

REMARK 3.9. *As a consequence of Proposition 3.8, asymptotic expectation and variance of* $T_z^{(N)}$ *are give as*

$$\mathbb{E}(T_z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} z^k p(n,k),$$
$$Var(T_z) = 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} z^{2k} p(n,k).$$

The right hand sides can be simplifies using the identity [Andrews, 1998, Theorems 1.1 & 1.4]

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z^k p(n,k) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1-z^i}.$$

We get

$$\mathbb{E}(T_z) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1-z^i} - 1,$$
$$Var(T_z) = 2\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1-z^{2i}} - 1\right).$$

Table 9 shows the asymptotic mean and variance for 51×51 rotations, i.e. $n = 25$, and different values of z. Finite sample expectation and variance for $N = 200$, $n = 25$, and $z = 0.5$ are 2.48 and 1.26 respectively, based on 1000 Monte Carlo runs. Empirical quantiles are given in Table 10.

TABLE 9. *Mean and variance of* T_z *for* $n = 25$.

$z =$	0.5	0.8	0.9	0.99
mean	2.46	291.45	402914.7	2.844628×10^{25}
variance	0.9047073	18.86372	870.2173	8.097291×10^{18}

TABLE 10. $P\left(T_z^{(N)} \leq w_p\right) = p$ *based on 1000 Monte Carlo runs with* $N = 200, n = 25, z = 0.5$.

p	0.01	0.05	0.10	0.25	0.50	0.75	0.90	0.95	0.99
w_p	0.93	1.16	1.30	1.66	2.20	2.94	3.94	4.65	7.38

3.2.5. *Distribution under fixed alternative hypotheses.*

PROPOSITION 3.10. *Let F be a probability measure on $[0,\pi]^n$ which is different from $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $\theta^{(1)},\dots,\theta^{(N)}$ be independent draws from F. Then, $T_z^{(N)}$ is asymptotically normal. In fact,*

$$\sqrt{N}(T_z^{(N)}-\mu)\to\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2)\qquad \text{as } N\to\infty,$$

with $\mu=\int r^2(\theta)F(d\theta)$ and $\sigma^2=4\left[\int\left(\int r(\theta)g(\theta,\phi)f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}(d\theta)\right)^2F(d\phi)-\mu^2\right]$, where g and r are defined as $r(\theta)=\int g(\theta,\phi)F(d\phi)$ and

$$g(\theta,\phi)=\frac{(1-\sqrt{z})^n\det\left[\frac{(1+\sqrt{z})^2+2\sqrt{z}(\cos\theta_k+\cos\phi_l)}{(1+z)^2-4\sqrt{z}(1+z)\cos\theta_k\cos\phi_l+2z(\cos 2\theta_k+\cos 2\phi_l)}\right]_{k,l}}{(4z)^{\binom{n}{2}/2}\prod_{i<j}(\cos\theta_i-\cos\theta_j)\prod_{i<j}(\cos\phi_i-\cos\phi_j)}.$$

PROOF. Proof of this proposition closely follows section 4 of Giné [1975b]. The key to fact is that $T_z^{(N)}$ can be written as

$$T_z^{(N)}=\frac{1}{N}\int\left|\sum_{i=1}^N g(\theta,\theta^{(i)})\right|^2 f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}(d\theta). \tag{13}$$

Assuming (13), Proposition (4.6) of Giné [1975b] directly applies and completes the proof. To prove (13), using Theorem (3.4), we can write

$$g(\theta,\phi)=\sum_\lambda z^{|\lambda|/2}\chi_\lambda(\theta)\chi_\lambda(\phi).$$

As a consequence we have

$$g(\theta,\theta^{(i)})g(\theta,\theta^{(j)})=\sum_{\lambda,\rho}z^{|\lambda|+|\rho|/2}\chi_\lambda(\theta)\chi_\lambda(\theta^{(i)})\chi_\rho(\theta)\chi_\rho(\theta^{(j)}).$$

Integrating against θ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int g(\theta,\theta^{(i)})g(\theta,\theta^{(j)})f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}(d\theta)&=\sum_{\lambda,\rho}z^{|\lambda|+|\rho|/2}\chi_\lambda(\theta^{(i)})\chi_\rho(\theta^{(j)})\int\chi_\lambda(\theta)\chi_\rho(\theta)f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}(d\theta)\\&=\sum_{\lambda,\rho}z^{|\lambda|+|\rho|/2}\chi_\lambda(\theta^{(i)})\chi_\rho(\theta^{(j)})\delta_{\lambda,\rho}\\&=\sum_\lambda z^{|\lambda|}\chi_\lambda(\theta^{(i)})\chi_\lambda(\theta^{(j)}).\end{aligned}$$

Summing over i and j and dividing by N gives

$$\frac{1}{N}\int [\sum_{i,j} g(\theta,\theta^{(i)})g(\theta,\theta^{(j)})]\nu(d\theta) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\lambda} z^{|\lambda|}\sum_{i,j}\chi_\lambda(\theta^{(i)})\chi_\lambda(\theta^{(j)}).$$

Applying (10) yields

$$\frac{1}{N}\int \left|\sum_i g(\theta,\theta^{(i)})\right|^2 \nu(d\theta) = \sum_{\lambda} z^{|\lambda|}\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_i \chi_\lambda(\theta^{(i)})\right|^2 = T_z^{(N)},$$

which proves (13) and completes the proof. □

REMARK 3.11. *A direct consequence is that $T_z^{(N)}$ is consistent against all fixed alternatives; not only the limiting distribution differs, so does the scaling. In particular, $\mathbb{P}_\nu\left(T_z^{(N)} > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right) \to 1$ as N tends to infinity, for all alternatives ν.*

4. Beyond the Eigenvalues. Although the test based on $T_z^{(N)}$ of section 3.2.3 proved successful in different examples, it failed to reject the null hypothesis against the alternative given by the new sampler of Jones et al. [2011], even after only one step of the sampler. To overcome this deficiency, it is needed, and natural, to resort to the properties beyond the eigenvalues. This section presents a test for the full Haar measure on $SO(2n+1)$ based on the machinery of section 3.2.1.

Let $G = SO(2n+1)$. Given data $g_1,\dots,g_N \in G$ independently drawn from a measure ν on G, consider testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \nu = \mu$, where μ is the uniform (Haar) measure. To construct a spectral test, use the orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}^2(G)$ given by the matrix coordinates of the irreducible representations; they form an orthonormal basis because of the Peter-Weyl theorem 3.1. Define the Fourier component corresponding to λ as

$$\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\pi^\lambda(g_i).$$

Note that $\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)$ is a $d_\lambda \times d_\lambda$ matrix. A test that rejects for large values of

$$U_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(N)} = N\sum_{\lambda\neq 0} c_\lambda \|\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)\|_F^2 \tag{14}$$

can be used, for a sequence of positive weights $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots)$. One wishes to simplify $U_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ into a closed form. What follows describes a way of simplifying $U_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ for $\boldsymbol{c}$ of a particular form.

Expand each summand in (14)

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)\|_F^2 &= Tr(\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)^*) = Tr(\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i,j}\pi_\lambda(g_i)\pi_\lambda(g_j)^*)\\ &= Tr(\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i,j}\pi_\lambda(g_i)\pi_\lambda(g_j^{-1})) = Tr(\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i,j}\pi_\lambda(g_ig_j^{-1}))\\ &= \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i,j}Tr(\pi_\lambda(g_ig_j^{-1})) = \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i,j}\chi_\lambda(g_ig_j^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second to third line follows from the fact that π^λ is a unitary matrix. Therefore, one can write

$$U_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i,j}\sum_{\lambda\neq 0} c_\lambda\chi_\lambda(g_ig_j^{-1}).$$

Thus, a closed from expression for $\sum_\lambda c_\lambda\chi_\lambda(h)$ would result in a closed form expression for $U_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(N)}$. This can be accomplished, for $\boldsymbol{c}$ of a particular form, using techniques from representation theory of $SO(2n+1)$. The following propositions are the key facts borrowed from representation theory. Note that the definition of the Schur functions as well as definitions from the theory of partitions are omitted here since all we need is the right hand side of (17), which does not require the definitions. For a textbook treatment of the Schur functions and partitions see Macdonald [1995], Andrews [1998].

PROPOSITION 4.1 (The Cauchy-Littlewood identity Weyl [1946], Section 7.9). *Let χ_λ be the irreducible character of $G = SO(2n+1)$ and s_λ the Schur function of symmetric function theory. Let $g \in G$ with eigenvalues $1, e^{\pm i\theta_1}, \ldots, e^{\pm i\theta_n}$. Then,*

$$\sum_\lambda s_\lambda(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\chi_\lambda(g) = \frac{\prod_{k<j}(1-x_kx_j)\prod_k(1+x_k)}{\prod_{k,j}(1-x_ke^{i\theta_j})(1-x_ke^{-i\theta_j})}. \tag{15}$$

PROPOSITION 4.2 (Macdonald [1995], page 80). *Let s_λ be the Schur function and $q \in [0,1]$. Then,*

$$s_\lambda(1,q,\ldots,q^{n-1}) = q^{n(\lambda)}\prod_{x\in\lambda'}\frac{1-q^{n-c(x)}}{1-q^{h(x)}}, \tag{16}$$

where $n(\lambda) = \sum_i \binom{\lambda_i'}{2}$, $h(x)$ is the hook length of a partition at x, and $c(x)$ is the content of a partition at x (note that the product is over $x \in \lambda'$, where λ' is transpose of λ).

Therefore, substituting $x_k = z \cdot q^{k-1}$ in (33) yields

$$\sum_{\lambda \neq 0} c_\lambda(z,q)\chi_\lambda(g) = \frac{\prod_{k<j}(1-z^2q^{k+j-2})\prod_k(1+zq^{k-1})}{\prod_{k,j}(1-zq^{k-1}e^{i\theta_j})(1-zq^{k-1}e^{-i\theta_j})} - 1, \tag{17}$$

where $1, e^{\pm i\theta_1}, \ldots, e^{\pm i\theta_n}$ are eigenvalues of g and

$$c_\lambda(z,q) = z^{|\lambda|}q^{n(\lambda)} \prod_{x \in \lambda'} \frac{1-q^{n-c(x)}}{1-q^{h(x)}}. \tag{18}$$

DEFINITION 4.3. *Define the test statistic as*

$$\begin{aligned} U_{z,q}^{(N)} &= N \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} c_\lambda(z,q) \|\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)\|_F^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,l=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\prod_{i<j}(1-z^2q^{i+j-2})\prod_i(1+zq^{i-1})}{\prod_{i,j}(1-zq^{i-1}e^{i\theta_j^{k,l}})(1-zq^{i-1}e^{-i\theta_j^{k,l}})} - 1 \right), \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $1, e^{\pm i\theta_1^{k,l}}, \ldots, e^{\pm i\theta_n^{k,l}}$ *are the eigenvalues of* $g_k g_l^T$.

REMARK 4.4. *The test based on* $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ *fits into the framework proposed by Giné [1975b]. In fact, the eigenfunction of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on* G *are exactly the matrix coordinates of the irreducible representations of* G*, for all compact classical groups. See Lévy [2008, Proposition 2.7.] for explicit formulas for the Laplace-Beltrami operator on* $SO(n)$ *and Kim [1998] for a brief review of the connection between the eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator and the matrix coordinates of the irreducible representations.*

The test based on $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ was applied to the new sampler of Jones et al. [2011] and exhibited non-trivial power against the alternative distribution generated by a single iteration of the sampler. For $z = 0.2, q = 0.4$, and $N = 200$ the histogram of 1000 values of $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ is illustrated in Figure 13.

The power of the 5%-level test is 0.17 which is non-trivial although not particularly high. However, this might well be a result of the small sample size. Note that the testing problem is a non-parameteric test of goodness-of-fit in $\binom{51}{2} = 1275$ dimensions with only 200 observations. The following remark discusses the sample size needed in terms of the dimension in non-parametric goodness-of-fit testing problems.



FIG 13. *Histogram of* $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ *under the null (blue) and alternative (red) with* $N = 200$, $n = 25$, $z = 0.2$, *and* $q = 0.4$ *based on* 1000 *Monte Carlo runs. The alternative is the distribution of the orthogonal matrices generated by a single iteration of the new sampler.*

REMARK 4.5 (On the sample size and minimax detection rate). *Arias-Castro et al. [2016] recently investigated the* ***curse of dimensionality*** *in goodness-of-fit testing problems. The results are described for the Euclidean space; the case of a manifold is a straightforward extension as mentioned in Arias-Castro et al. [2016]. Let* $\mathcal{H}$ *be a class of real-valued functions on* $\mathbb{R}^d$ *and* δ *a pseudo-metric on* $\mathcal{H}$. *For* $\epsilon > 0$ *and a test* ϕ *of the null hypothesis* f_0, *define the worst-case risk of* ϕ, *on a sample of size* m, *as*

$$R_\epsilon^{(m)}(\phi, f_0, \mathcal{H}) = \mathbb{E}_{f_0}^{(m)}\phi + \sup\{\mathbb{E}_f^{(m)}[1-\phi] \mid f \in \mathcal{H}, \delta(f, f_0) \geq \epsilon\}.$$

The minimax risk is

$$R_\epsilon^{(m)}(f_0, \mathcal{H}) = \inf_\phi R_\epsilon^{(m)}(\phi, f_0, \mathcal{H}).$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_s^d(L)$ *be the Hölder class of function* $f : [0,1]^d \to \mathbb{R}$ *such that* f *has* $\lfloor s \rfloor$ *derivatives that satisfies*

$$|f^{\lfloor s \rfloor}(x) - f^{\lfloor s \rfloor}(y)| \leq L\|x - y\|^{s - \lfloor s \rfloor}, \quad \forall x, y \in [0,1]^d.$$

Then, Theorem 1 in [Arias-Castro et al., 2016] states that

$$R_\epsilon^{(m)}(f_0, \mathcal{H}_s^d(L)) \geq 1/2. \quad \text{if } \epsilon < cm^{-2s/(4s+d)},$$

where the constant c depends only on (d, s, L). In particular, if $d \gg \log m$, the upper-bound on ϵ does not tend to zero as m goes to infinity. Therefore, in order to have non-trivial power against alternatives close to the null, one needs to have $\log m/d > \tilde{c}$. That mean, the sample size needs to be exponential in the dimension. In the case of $SO(51)$, the dimension is 1275. Even a sample size of $N = 50000$ yields $\log(N)/d \approx 0.0085$.

Consider the same setup as above; $N = 200, z = 0.2$, and $q = 0.4$. $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ was computed 250 times and the empirical distribution of the 250 values under the null and alternative were compared using Anderson-Darling and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests of goodness-of-fit, where alternative was taken to be the output of the new sampler after different number of iterations. The values of the Anderson-Darling statistic and Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic for each number of iterations are illustrated in Figure 14. The corresponding p-values are shown in Table 11.



FIG 14. *Values of the Anderson-Darling statistic (left) and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic (right) versus the number of iterations of the new sampler.*

TABLE 11. *p-values corresponding to iterated random reflections*

# of iterations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
A-D test	5.94e-43	3.92e-02	8.02e-01	9.25e-01	7.29e-01	9.90e-01	3.26e-01	3.52e-01
K-S test	≈ 0	0.11	0.83	0.82	0.43	0.99	0.46	0.64

Both tests clearly indicate that the distribution of the output is not close to uniform after only one iteration. The Anderson-Darling test rejects the null hypothesis at 5% level for the distribution of the output after two iterations, suggesting some departure from uniformity. None of them provide any evidence of departure from the null beyond two iterations. This is in agreement with the prescription of the number of steps given in Jones et al. [2011]. Strictly speaking, these tests use $250 \times 200 = 50000$ observations, but as discussed in Remark 4.5, this is not a particularly large sample size due to the high-dimensional nature of the problem.

4.1. *Distribution under the null and alternative.* The asymptotic distribution of $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ under the null and fixed alternatives can be derived in a similar fashion to those of $T_z^{(N)}$.

PROPOSITION 4.6 (Asymptotic null distribution). *Assume $g_1, \dots, g_N$ are independent draws from the uniform distribution on $SO(2n+1)$,and $z, q \in (0,1)$. Then,*

$$U_{z,q}^{(N)} \to U_{z,q} = \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} \frac{c_\lambda(z,q)}{d_\lambda} \chi^2_{d_\lambda^2},$$

where $d_\lambda = \chi_\lambda(I)$ is the dimension of the irreducible representation corresponding to λ, $c_\lambda(z,q)$ is defined in (18), and the chi-square variables are mutually independent.

PROOF. The statement follows from the orthogonality relations between the matrix-coordinates of the irreducible representations, the central limit theorem, and the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}[(\pi_{ij}^\lambda)^2] = 1/d_\lambda.$$

□

The following lemma is needed for the derivation of the asymptotic distribution under a fixed alternative.

LEMMA 4.7. *For $g_1, \dots, g_N \in SO(2n+1)$ one has*

$$U_{z,q}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \int \left| \sum_{i=1}^N u(g_i, g) \right|^2 \mu(dg), \tag{20}$$

where u is defined through

$$u(g,h) = \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} \sqrt{d_\lambda c_\lambda(z,q)} \chi_\lambda(g^T h). \tag{21}$$

PROOF. Expand the squared sum and substitute u by its definition to get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N u(g_i, g) \right|^2 &= \sum_{i,j=1}^N u(g_i, g) u(g_j, g) \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\lambda,\rho \neq 0} \sqrt{d_\lambda c_\lambda(z,q) d_\rho c_\rho(z,q)} \chi_\lambda(g_i g^T) \chi_\rho(g_j g^T). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating over g yields

$$\int \left| \sum_{i=1}^{N} u(g_i, g) \right|^2 \mu(dg) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \sum_{\lambda,\rho \neq 0} \sqrt{d_\lambda c_\lambda(z,q) d_\rho c_\rho(z,q)} \left(\int \chi_\lambda(g_i g^T) \chi_\rho(g_j g^T) \mu(dg) \right).$$

Theorem (4.5) in Chapter 2 of Bröcker and tom Dieck [1985] proves that

$$\int \chi_\lambda(g_i g^T) \chi_\rho(g_j g^T) \mu(dg) = \delta_{\lambda,\rho} \frac{\chi_\lambda(g_i g_j^T)}{d_\lambda}.$$

Substitute this into the last equation to get

$$\int \left| \sum_{i=1}^{N} u(g_i, g) \right|^2 \mu(dg) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} c_\lambda(z,q) \chi_\lambda(g_i g_j^T),$$

which finishes the proof because of Definition 4.3. □

The asymptotic distribution under the alternative is given as follows.

PROPOSITION 4.8 (Asymptotic alternative distribution). *Let F be a distribution on $SO(2n+1)$ different from the uniform measure. Given data $g_1, \ldots, g_N$ independently drawn from F, $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ is normally distributed. In fact,*

$$\sqrt{N}(U_{z,q}^{(N)} - \upsilon) \to \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \quad \text{as } N \to \infty,$$

with $\upsilon = \int r^2(g) F(dg)$ and $\sigma^2 = 4\left[\int \left(\int r(g) u(g,h) \mu(dg)\right)^2 F(dh) - \upsilon^2\right]$, where u is defined in (21) and r is defined as $r(g) = \int u(g,h) F(dh)$

PROOF. Proof follows from Proposition (4.6) of Giné [1975b] and the fact (20) above. □

REMARK 4.9. *A direct consequence is that $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ is consistent against all fixed alternatives; not only the limiting distribution differs, so does the scaling. In particular, $\mathbb{P}_F\left(U_{z,q}^{(N)} > c_{1-\alpha}^{z,q}\right) \to 1$ as N tends to infinity, for all alternatives F.*

5. Numerical Comparison of Different Tests. This section compares different tests discussed in this paper on the Kac's random walk and the walk generated by iterated random reflections with a particular focus on detection of the cutoff. Focus on the following four test: Rayleigh's test, Gine's test, $T_z^{(N)}$, and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$. The numerical observations are summarized below.

The Kac's walk. Each test was computed 1000 times on the samples generated by the Kac's walk for different number of steps. Each of the 1000 simulations were based on $N = 200$ observations; $T_z^{(N)}$ was computed with $z = 0.5$ and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ with $z = 0.2$ and $q = 0.4$. The samples were generated using k steps of the Kac's walk for

$$k \in \{100, 150, 200, 250, 300, 350, 400, 450, 500\}.$$

For each fixed number of steps the 1000 values were compared to those corresponding to the uniform distribution using the Anderson-Darling and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. The values are plotted against the number of steps of the chain. This is illustrated in Figure 15 only for the Anderson-Darling test. The analogous plots for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test are very similar.



FIG 15. *Values of the Anderson-Darling statistic for comparison of the uniform sample and the Kac's walk based on: Rayleigh's statistic (top left), Gine's statistic (top right),* $T_z^{(N)}$ *(bottom left), and* $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ *(bottom right).*

Figure 15 suggests that the Gine's test has the least power against the alternative generated be the Kac's walk among the four tests considered here. The Rayleigh's test and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ seem to perform similarly, indicating some evidence for a cutoff but, perhaps, earlier than it should possibly occur. The test based on $T_z^{(N)}$ outperforms the other three tests and provides evidence that a cutoff does not occur with less than 350 step, if it occurs at all.

Product of random reflections. The same procedure was repeated for the product of k random reflections, for

$$k \in \{50, 75, 90, 100, 110, 125, 140, 150, 175, 200\}.$$

For each fixed k, each test was computed 1000 times and the values were compared to those corresponding to the uniform distribution using the Anderson-Darling test. The values are plotted against the number of steps of the chain in Figure 16.



FIG 16. *Values of the Anderson-Darling statistic for comparison of the uniform sample and the product of random reflections based on: Rayleigh's statistic (top left), Gine's statistic (top right),* $T_z^{(N)}$ *(bottom left), and* $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ *(bottom right).*

In this example, the Rayleigh's test has the least power; it fails to reject the null long before the actual cutoff occurs. The Gine's test and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ are qualitatively identical. They detect that the chain does not mix in 100 steps and suggest that the mixing might happen in 125 to 140 steps, which is seen, using $T_z^{(N)}$, to be inaccurate. Again, $T_z^{(N)}$ is superior to the other three tests; it picks up the occurrence of the cutoff and suggests that it might happen in around 175 steps.

The new sampler. The same procedure was repeated for $1 \leq k \leq 8$ iterations of the new sampler of Jones et al. [2011]. For each fixed k, each test was computed 1000 times and the values were compared to those corresponding to the uniform distribution using the Anderson-Darling test. The values are plotted against the number of steps of the chain in Figure 17.



FIG 17. *Values of the Anderson-Darling statistic for comparison of the uniform sample and the new sampler based on: Rayleigh's statistic (top left), Gine's statistic (top right),* $T_z^{(N)}$ *(bottom left), and* $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ *(bottom right).*

The Rayleigh's test, the Gine's test, and the test based on $T_z^{(N)}$ exhibit no power against this alternative. Only $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ has power against the alternative generated by a single iteration of the sampler. It also rejects the null hypothesis at 5%-level for the sample generated by two iterations of the sampler. It, too, has no power beyond two iterations. This is in agreement with the recommendation of Jones et al. [2011] on the number of iterations needed for mixing of the sampler.

6. Asymptotic Properties Under Local Alternatives. As proved in sections 3 and 4, the tests based on $T_z^{(N)}$ and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ are consistent against all fixed alternative distributions on the eigenvalues and on the group of all orthogonal matrices, respectively. This is a desirable property, but it is of more interest to investigate the power of the tests in the regime where the alternative approaches the null as the sample size goes to infinity. Formally, it is of interest to analyze the tests when testing $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ against $H_1 : \theta = \theta_N$, where θ_N varies with the sample size N. A standard regime is $\theta_N = \theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N}$ for a fixed $h \in \Omega$.

It suffices to consider only compact spaces since all the examples in this paper are compact. For a compact space X, say $X = SO(2n+1)$, the space of square-integrable functions on X, $\mathcal{L}^2(X)$, is a separable Hilbert space. That is, the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H} = \mathcal{L}^2(X)$ has a countable orthonormal basis.

Following the notation of Section 3.2.1, let $1 = f_0, f_1, \ldots$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{H}$.

Let $\{P_h \mid h \in \mathbb{H}\}$ be a family of distributions on X, where P_h is absolutely continuous with respect to P_{h_0} with density p_h. Given independent observations $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ from P_h consider the local hypothesis testing problem $H_0 : h = h_0$ against $H_1 : h = h_0 + \theta/\sqrt{N}$. The log-likelihood of the data is

$$L_{N,\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log p_{h_0+\theta/\sqrt{N}}(x_i).$$

Under enough regulatory assumptions, the following 'Taylor expansion' holds

$$\log p_{h_0+h}(x) \doteq \ell_{h_0+h}(x) = \langle \nabla_h \ell_{h_0}(x), h\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle h, \nabla_h^2 \ell_{h_0}(x) h\rangle + o(\|h\|^2).$$

Moreover, assume that $\nabla_h \ell$ can be expanded as

$$\nabla_h \ell_{h_0}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \widehat{\ell}_{h_0}(i) f_i(x).$$

Under these assumptions the log-likelihood can be written as

$$L_{N,\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \widehat{\ell}_{h_0}(i)\theta_i \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} f_i(x_k)\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left\langle \theta, \left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N} \nabla_h^2 \ell_{h_0}(x_k)\right)\theta \right\rangle + o(\|\theta\|^2/N).$$

By the central limit theorem and the law of large numbers, one gets

$$L_{N,\theta} \to \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta_i Z_i - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta_i^2 \widehat{\ell}_{h_0}(i)^2,$$

where $Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \widehat{\ell}_{h_0}(i)^2)$ and Z_i's are independent. Various statistical questions can be answered asymptotically using this limiting log-likelihood. Le Cam's theory of *asymptotically normal experiments* is the subject that provides a rigorous treatment of these ideas. The basic concepts are introduced below, see Le Cam [2012] for a textbook treatment in full generality and Lehmann and Romano [2006, Chapters 12 & 13] for an exposition to the theory in the case of finite-dimensional parametric families.

First, the notion of a Gaussian experiment on a Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$ is reviewed. Identify $\mathbb{H}$ with $\ell_2(\mathbb{R})$ via the orthonormal basis $\{f_i\}$. That is, each $v = \sum v_i f_i \in \mathbb{H}$ is identified with $(v_1, v_2, \ldots) \in \ell_2(\mathbb{R})$. The standard Gaussian process $\boldsymbol{G}_0$ on $\mathbb{H}$ corresponds to $\boldsymbol{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2, \ldots) \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ such that Z_i are

independent standard normal random variables. For $v \in \mathbb{H}$, $\langle \boldsymbol{Z}, v\rangle = \sum_i Z_i v_i$ is distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, \|v\|^2)$.

The *standard Gaussian shift experiment* on $\mathbb{H}$ is a collection of stochastic processes $\{\boldsymbol{G}_v \mid v \in \mathbb{H}\}$ such that $\boldsymbol{G}_v$ has log-density $\langle \boldsymbol{Z}, v\rangle - \|v\|^2/2$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{G}_0$. That is, $\boldsymbol{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ is distributed according to $\boldsymbol{G}_v$ if and only if Z_i are independent random variables and $Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(v_i, 1)$. In other words it is a shift of the standard Gaussian process with a vector v, therefore carrying the name *Gaussian shift experiment*. In particular, if $\boldsymbol{Z} \sim \boldsymbol{G}_v$ and $u \in \mathbb{H}$ then $\langle \boldsymbol{Z}, u\rangle = \sum_i Z_i u_i$ is distributed as $\mathcal{N}(\langle v, u\rangle, \|u\|^2)$.

The heuristic Taylor expansion sketched above allows one to deduce asymptotic optimality properties for relatively large class of problems from optimality properties of the limiting Gaussian shift experiments. Formal justification of such an expansion needs new definitions. A sequence of probability measures Q_n is called *contiguous* with respect to another sequence P_n if $\lim P_n(E_n) = 0$ implies $\lim Q_n(E_n) = 0$. This is an asymptotic version of absolute continuity. For local families considered above, contiguity follow from a form of mean differentiability.

Definition 6.1 (Quadratic Mean Differentiability). *The family of distributions $\{P_\theta \mid \theta \in \Omega\}$ is quadratic mean diffrentiable (QMD) at θ_0 if there exists a function $\nu(x \mid \theta_0)$, for all $x \in X$, such that*

$$\int_X \left[\sqrt{p_{\theta_0+h}} - \sqrt{p_{\theta_0}} - \left\langle \nu(x \mid \theta_0), h\right\rangle\right]^2 \mu(dx) = o(\|h\|^2),$$

as $\|h\| \to 0$. ν is called the quadratic mean derivative at θ_0.

Remark 6.2. *If p_θ is QMD at θ_0 then $p_{\theta_0+h/\sqrt{N}}$ is contiguous with respect to p_{θ_0}.*

The following lemmas of Le Cam are the key facts allowing for study of asymptotically normal experiments.

Proposition 6.3 (Le Cam's first lemma, Lehmann and Romano [2006], Theorem 12.2.3). *Suppose p_θ is QMD at θ_0 with derivative ν. Let $\eta(x \mid \theta_0) = \nu(x \mid \theta_0)/\sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)}$ be the score function and the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)$, defined through $\mathcal{I}_{ij}(\eta_0) = \mathbb{E}[\langle \eta_i(\cdot \mid \theta_0), \eta_j(\cdot \mid \theta_0)\rangle]$, be the Fisher information at θ_0. Consider the log-likelihood*

$$L_{N,h} = \sum_{i=1}^N \log p_{\theta_0+h/\sqrt{N}}(x_i) - \log p_{\theta_0}(x_i).$$

Then,

$$L_{N,h} - \left[\langle h, Z_N\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle h, \mathcal{I}(\theta_0)h\rangle\right] = o_{p_{\theta_0}}(1),$$

where Z_N *is defined through*

$$Z_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\eta(x_i \mid \theta_0).$$

PROPOSITION 6.4 (Le Cam's third lemma, Lehmann and Romano [2006], Theorem 12.3.3). *Suppose* Q_N *is contiguous with respect to* P_N*. For a random variable* T_N *and the log-likelihood* L_N *assume that* (T_N, L_N) *converges in distribution to* (T, L) *under* P_N*. Then, for any bounded continuous function* f

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_N} f(T_n, L_n) \to \mathbb{E}[f(T, L)e^L].$$

These facts allow for passing many questions to the limit and for computing the limiting distribution under the alternative; using them, the asymptotic properties of $T_z^{(N)}$ and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ are studied in the following sections.

6.1. *Asymptotic admissibility.* The following lemma relates a testing problem under the experiment $\{P_{\theta_0+h/\sqrt{N}} \mid h \in \mathbb{H}\}$ to the limiting Gaussian shift experiment $\{\boldsymbol{G}_h \mid h \in \mathbb{H}\}$, assuming $\{P_\theta\}$ is QMD at θ_0.

PROPOSITION 6.5 (Lehmann and Romano [2006], Theorem 13.4.1). *For a sequence of tests* ϕ_N*, let* $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(h)$ *be the power of* ϕ_N *against* $P_{\theta_0+h/\sqrt{N}}$*. Then, for any subsequence* $\{n_j\}$ *there is a further subsequence* n_{j_k} *and a test* ϕ *in the limiting experiment such that, for every* h*,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(h) = \boldsymbol{\beta}(h),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}(h)$ *is the power of* ϕ *against* $\boldsymbol{G}_h$*.*

DEFINITION 6.6 (Admissibility). *A test* ϕ *is called admissible if for any test* $\tilde{\phi}$ *such that* $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(h) \geq \boldsymbol{\beta}(h)$ *for every* h *one has* $\phi = \tilde{\phi}$ *almost surely.*

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Proposition 6.5.

COROLLARY 6.7. *Let* ϕ_N^0 *be a sequence of test in the experiment* $\{P_{\theta_0+h/\sqrt{N}} \mid h \in \mathbb{H}\}$ *such that* ϕ_N^0 *converges to an admissible test* ϕ *in the limiting experiment* $\{\boldsymbol{G}_h \mid h \in \mathbb{H}\}$*. Let* ϕ_N *be another sequence of tests such that*

$\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(h) \geq \boldsymbol{\beta}^0_N(h)$ for every h, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^0_N$ are the power functions of ϕ_N and ϕ^0_N, respectively. Then, ϕ_N and ϕ^0_N are asymptotically equivalent in the following sense. For any subsequence n_j there exists a further subsequence n_{j_k} such that, for every h,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{n_{j_k}}(h) = \boldsymbol{\beta}(h),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}(h)$ is the power of ϕ.

The last corollary motivates the following definition: a sequence of tests ϕ_N in the experiment $\{P_{\theta_0+h/\sqrt{N}} \mid h \in \mathbb{H}\}$ is called *asymptotically admissible* if it converges to an admissible test ϕ.

The following result of Birnbaum [1955] is a useful tool for proving admissibility in Gaussian shift experiments.

LEMMA 6.8 (Strasser [1985], Theorem 30.4). *Let $C \subset \mathbb{H}$ be a closed convex subset. Then,*

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad x \notin C, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad x \in C, \end{cases}$$

is admissible for the testing problem $h = 0$ against $h \neq 0$ and is uniquely determined by its power function.

The following corollary is immediate.

COROLLARY 6.9. *The limiting tests based on T_z and $U_{z,q}$ are admissible. Therefore, the tests based on $\{T^{(N)}_z\}$ and $\{U^{(N)}_{z,q}\}$ are asymptotically admissible.*

PROOF. The test based on T_z rejects for $\{\boldsymbol{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^\infty \mid \sum_\lambda z^{|\lambda|} Z^2_\lambda > c_{z,1-\alpha}\}$. The set

$$C_z = \{\boldsymbol{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^\infty \mid \sum_\lambda z^{|\lambda|} Z^2_\lambda \leq c_{z,1-\alpha}\}$$

is clearly convex and closed. Thus the assertion follows from Lemma 6.1. Proof for $U_{z,q}$ is similar. □

6.2. *Power calculations under local alternatives.*

6.2.1. *Local power of $T_z^{(N)}$ against finite-dimensional parametric families.* Let $\{f(\cdot \mid \theta) \mid \theta \in \Omega\}$ be a Q.M.D. family of density functions with respect to the eigenvalue distribution induced by the Haar measure, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ for a fixed k. Assume that $f(\cdot \mid \theta_0) = 1$, that is, θ_0 corresponds to $f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$. Given data $x_1, \ldots, x_N \sim f(\cdot \mid \theta)$ consider testing $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ against $H_1 : \theta = \theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N}$ for a fixed $h \in \Omega$. Let $\ell(x \mid \theta) = \log f(x \mid \theta)$ be the *log-likelihood function*, $\eta(x \mid \theta) = \nabla_\theta \ell(x \mid \theta)$ the *score function*, and $\mathcal{I}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_\theta \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(x \mid \theta)$ the *Fisher information matrix* at θ. Let L_N denote the log-likelihood of the data; to use Le Cam's third lemma one needs the asymptotic joint distribution of $(T_z^{(N)}, L_N)$. The log-likelihood is

(22)
$$\begin{aligned} L_N &= \sum_{i=1}^N \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N}) - \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(x_i \mid \theta_0)^T \frac{h}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1}{2N} h^T \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0) h + o_p(1) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(x_i \mid \theta_0) \right)^T h + \frac{1}{2} h^T \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0) \right) h + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

The score function of QMD families is square-integrable (Le Cam's first theorem); hence, the Peter-Weyl theorem 3.1 yields the following expansion for $\eta(\cdot \mid \theta_0)$:

$$\eta(\cdot \mid \theta_0) = \sum_\lambda \widehat{\eta}(\lambda) \chi_\lambda(\cdot), \tag{23}$$

where $\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)$ is the Fourier coefficient $\int \eta(x \mid \theta_0) \chi_\lambda(x) dx$ and the equality is interpreted in $\mathcal{L}^2(f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})$. Substituting (23) in (22) yields

$$L_N = \sum_\lambda \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \chi_\lambda(x_i) \right) + \frac{1}{2} h^T \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0) \right) h + o_p(1).$$

As $N \to \infty$, using Law of Large Numbers and Central Limit Theorem, one has

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0) \to -\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)$$
$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \chi_\lambda(x_i) \to Z_\lambda,$$

where Z_λ are independent standard normal variables. The joint limiting distribution of $(T_z^{(N)}, L_N)$ is

$$(T_z^{(N)}, L_N) \to (T_z, L),$$

where

$$T_z = \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} Z_\lambda^2 \quad \text{and} \quad L = \sum_{\lambda} (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h) Z_\lambda - \frac{1}{2} h^T \mathcal{I}(\theta_0) h. \tag{24}$$

Since $f(\cdot \mid \theta)$ is Q.M.D. Le Cam's third lemma implies that the limiting distribution of $T_z^{(N)}$ under $f(\cdot \mid \theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N})$ is given by the following characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E}_h e^{itT_z} = \mathbb{E}_0 e^{itT_z} e^L.$$

Using (24) and independence of Z_λ's one gets

$$\mathbb{E}_0 e^{itT_z} e^L = e^{-\frac{1}{2} h^T \mathcal{I}(\theta_0) h} \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{E}_0 e^{itz^{|\lambda|} Z_\lambda^2 + (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h) Z_\lambda}.$$

For each λ, Z_λ is a standard normal variable; therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0 e^{itz^{|\lambda|} Z_\lambda^2 + (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h) Z_\lambda} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itz^{|\lambda|} x^2 + (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h) x} e^{-x^2/2} dx \\ &= \frac{e^{\frac{(\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itz^{|\lambda|} x^2} e^{-\frac{(x - (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h))^2}{2}} dx \\ &= e^{\frac{(\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} e^{itz^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

where $U_\lambda \sim \chi_1^2\left((\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2\right)$ is a non-central chi-square variable on one degree of freedom with non-centrality parameter equal to $(\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_h e^{itT_z} &= e^{\frac{1}{2}[-h^T \mathcal{I}(\theta_0) h + \sum_\lambda (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2]} \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{E} e^{itz^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda} \\ &= e^{\frac{1}{2}[-h^T \mathcal{I}(\theta_0) h + \sum_\lambda (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2]} \mathbb{E} e^{it \sum_\lambda z^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda} \\ &= \mathbb{E} e^{it \sum_\lambda z^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The last step holds because $h^T\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)h = \sum_\lambda(\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2$, which can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}(\theta_0) &= \mathbb{E}\eta(x \mid \theta_0)\eta^T(x \mid \theta_0)\\ &= \mathbb{E}\sum_\lambda \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)\chi_\lambda(x)\sum_\lambda \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T\chi_\lambda(x)\\ &= \mathbb{E}\sum_{\lambda,\mu} \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)\widehat{\eta}(\mu)^T\chi_\lambda(x)\chi_\mu(x)\\ &= \sum_{\lambda,\mu} \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)\widehat{\eta}(\mu)^T\mathbb{E}\chi_\lambda(x)\chi_\mu(x)\\ &= \sum_\lambda \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T,\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the orthogonality relations between irreducible characters of the orthogonal group. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}h^T\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)h &= \sum_\lambda h^T\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h\\ &= \sum_\lambda (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2.\end{aligned}$$

The limiting distribution of $T_z^{(N)}$ under the alternative $\theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N}$ is given by (25) as

$$T_z \sim \sum_{\lambda\neq 0} z^{|\lambda|}U_\lambda, \tag{26}$$

where U_λ are independently distributed as $\chi_1^2\left((\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2\right)$, a non-central chi-square variable on one degree of freedom with non-centrality parameter equal to $(\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2$.

Let $c_{z,1-\alpha}$ be the asymptotic rejection threshold for $T_z^{(N)}$. That is, using Proposition 3.8,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^\infty z^k\chi^2_{p(n,k)} > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right) = \alpha,$$

where $p(n,k)$ is the number of partitions of k into at most n parts and the chi-square variables are independent. Then, the following proposition is an immediate consequence of the argument above.

PROPOSITION 6.10. *Using above notation, the asymptotic power under the local alternative* $\theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N}$ *is*

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(h) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right),$$

for U_λ *defined in (26).*

EXAMPLE 6.11. *For* $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ *let* $f(x \mid \theta) \propto \exp(\theta \operatorname{tr}(x))$. *Then,* $\eta(x \mid 0) = \operatorname{tr}(x)$ *and* $\widehat{\eta}(\lambda) = 0$ *for* $\lambda \neq (1)$. *The local power under* $\theta/\sqrt{N}$ *is*

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(\theta) = \mathbb{P}\left(z\ \chi_1^2(\theta^2) + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} z^k \chi^2_{p(n,k)} > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right).$$

REMARK 6.12. *It is not necessary to restrict attention to finite dimensional alternatives for local power calculations. The results of this section can be extended to families with infinite-dimensional parameter space, under mild regularity conditions. In fact, for a Hilbert space* $\mathbb{H}$ *and a family of distributions* $\{f(\cdot \mid \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{H}\}$ *the theory of asymptotically normal experiments is similar to the finite-dimensional case. To avoid technical complexity this section has focused on the finite-dimensional case. However, details are carried out for a canonical infinite-dimensional exponential family of alternatives in the next example.*

EXAMPLE 6.13 (An infinite-dimensional family of alternatives). *For* $\Theta = (\theta^\lambda)_\lambda \in \ell^2(\mathbb{R})$ *consider the following exponential family*

$$f(x \mid \Theta) \propto e^{\sum_\lambda \theta^\lambda \chi_\lambda(x)}.$$

Since $\Theta \in \ell^2$, *the function* $\ell(x \mid \Theta) = \sum_\lambda \theta^\lambda \chi_\lambda(x)$ *is well-defined and* $\ell(\cdot \mid \Theta) \in \mathcal{L}^2(f_{1,\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})$. *Moreover, for* $\Theta = 0$, $\ell(x \mid \Theta) = 0$. *Thus* $f(x \mid 0)$ *corresponds to the Haar measure. Since* $\ell(\cdot \mid \Theta)$ *is a continuous function and* $SO(2n+1)$ *is compact, it is bounded. Therefore* $f(\cdot \mid \Theta)$ *is integrable and defines a probability distribution. Fix* $\Theta_0 \in \ell^2(\mathbb{R})$. *To compute the local power against* $H_1 : \Theta = \Theta_0/\sqrt{N}$, *define a one-parameter exponential family as follows. For* $t \in \mathbb{R}$ *define*

$$\tilde{f}_t(x) = f(x \mid \Theta_0)^t \propto e^{t \sum_\lambda \theta_0^\lambda \chi_\lambda(x)}.$$

Testing $H_0 : \Theta = 0$ *against* $H_1 : \Theta = \Theta_0/\sqrt{N}$ *is equivalent to testing* $\tilde{H}_0 : t = 0$ *against* $\tilde{H}_1 : t = 1/\sqrt{N}$. *The later can be studied using the methods*

of this section for finite-dimensional alternatives. Indeed, Proposition 6.10 directly applies. The log-likelihood function is $\tilde{\ell}(x \mid t) = t\sum_\lambda \theta_0^\lambda \chi_\lambda(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t)$, *where* $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(t)$ *is the cumulant generating function corresponding to* $\tilde{f}_t$. *The score function at* $t = 0$ *is*

$$\tilde{\eta}(x \mid 0) = \sum_\lambda \theta_0^\lambda \chi_\lambda(x).$$

Expansion of the score function in terms of the characters is already given as

$$\widehat{\eta}(\lambda) = \theta_0^\lambda.$$

Invoking Proposition 6.10 yields that the local power is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right),$$

where U_λ*'s are independent and distributed as a non-central chi-square on one degree of freedom with non-centrality parameter equal to* $(\theta_0^\lambda)^2$, *respectively. In particular, this recovers the previous example in which* $f(x \mid \theta) \propto \exp(\theta \operatorname{tr}(x))$; *here* $\theta_0^\lambda = 0$ *for* $\lambda \neq (1)$ *and* $\theta_0^{(1)} = \theta$.

6.2.2. *Local power of* $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ *against finite-dimensional parametric families.* Power calculation for $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ against local alternatives is very similar to that in the previous section. The derivation is only sketched here.

Let $\{f(\cdot \mid \theta) \mid \theta \in \Omega\}$ be a Q.M.D. family of density functions with respect to the Haar measure, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ for a fixed k. Assume that $f(\cdot \mid \theta_0) = 1$; that is, θ_0 corresponds to the Haar measure. Given data $x_1, \ldots, x_N \sim f(\cdot \mid \theta)$, consider testing $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ against $H_1 : \theta = \theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N}$ for a fixed $h \in \Omega$. The log-likelihood of the data is

$$L_N = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(x_i \mid \theta_0)\right)^T h + \frac{1}{2} h^T \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0)\right) h + o_p(1).$$

Assuming $\eta(\cdot \mid \theta_0) \in \mathcal{L}^2(SO(2n+1))$, one has

$$\eta(\cdot \mid \theta_0) = \sum_\lambda \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda} \widehat{\eta}_{ij}(\lambda) \pi_{ij}^\lambda(\cdot) \sqrt{d_\lambda}.$$

Substituting it in the previous equation yields

$$L_N = \sum_{\lambda\neq 0}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda} \widehat{\eta}_{ij}(\lambda)^T h \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\sqrt{d_\lambda}}{\sqrt{N}} \pi_{ij}^{\lambda}(\cdot)\right) + \frac{1}{2} h^T \left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0)\right) h + o_p(1).$$

The law of large numbers and central limit theorem give

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(x_i \mid \theta_0) \to -\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)$$
$$\frac{\sqrt{d_\lambda}}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_{ij}^{\lambda}(x_i) \to Z_{ij}^{\lambda},$$

where Z_{ij}^{λ} are independent standard normal variables and $\mathcal{I}$ is the Fisher information matrix. Therefore, the joint limiting distribution of $(U_{z,q}^{(N)}, L_N)$ under the null is

$$(U_{z,q}^{(N)}, L_N) \to (U_{z,q}, L),$$

where $U_{z,q}$ and L are

$$U_{z,q} = \sum_{\lambda\neq 0} \frac{c_\lambda(z,q)}{d_\lambda} \sum_{i,j=1}^{\lambda} (Z_{ij}^{\lambda})^2$$
$$L = \sum_{\lambda\neq 0}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda} \widehat{\eta}_{ij}(\lambda)^T h \cdot Z_{ij}^{\lambda} - \frac{1}{2} h^T \mathcal{I}(\theta_0) h.$$

Using Le Cam's third lemma, the limiting characteristic function of $U_{z,q}$ under the alternative is

$$\mathbb{E}_h e^{itU_{z,q}} = \mathbb{E}_0 e^{itU_{z,q}} e^{L},$$

which, similar to (25), simplifies to

$$\mathbb{E}_h e^{itU_{z,q}} = \mathbb{E} e^{it\sum_\lambda \frac{c_\lambda(z,q)}{d_\lambda} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda} X_{ij}^{\lambda}},$$

where X_{ij}^{λ} is a non-central chi-square variable on one degree of freedom with non-centrality parameter equal to $\left(\widehat{\eta}_{ij}(\lambda)^T h\right)^2$ and $\{X_{ij}^{\lambda}\}$ are mutually independent. Therefore

$$U_{z,q} \cong \sum_{\lambda} \frac{c_\lambda(z,q)}{d_\lambda} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda} X_{ij}^{\lambda}.$$

Let $c_{1-\alpha}^{z,q}$ be the asymptotic rejection cutoff for the level α test based on $U_{z,q}$. That it,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\lambda\neq 0}\frac{c_\lambda(z,q)}{d_\lambda}\chi^2_{d_\lambda^2} > c_{1-\alpha}^{z,q}\right) = \alpha.$$

The following proposition is a summary of the discussion above:

PROPOSITION 6.14. *Using the notation used above, the asymptotic local power of $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ against $\theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N}$ is*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\lambda\neq 0}\frac{c_\lambda(z,q)}{d_\lambda}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda} X_{ij}^\lambda > c_{1-\alpha}^{z,q}\right).$$

We conclude this section by calculating the local power against a particular infinite-dimensional family of alternatives.

EXAMPLE 6.15. *Similar to Example 6.13, consider the following canonical alternative. For $\Theta = (\theta_{ij}^\lambda) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{R})$ define*

$$f(x \mid \Theta) \propto \exp\left(\sum_{\lambda\neq 0}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda}\theta_{ij}^\lambda\frac{\pi_{ij}^\lambda(x)}{\sqrt{d_\lambda}}\right).$$

$f(\cdot \mid \Theta)$ defines a distribution on $SO(2n+1)$. Consider the standard local testing problem

$$H_0 : \Theta = 0 \quad \textit{against} \quad H_1 : \Theta = \Gamma/\sqrt{N}.$$

Fix Γ and consider the following embedded one-dimensional exponential family

$$\tilde{f}_t(x) \propto \exp\left(t\sum_{\lambda\neq 0}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda}\gamma_{ij}^\lambda\frac{\pi_{ij}^\lambda(x)}{\sqrt{d_\lambda}}\right),$$

and the corresponding testing problem $H_0 : t = 0$ against $H_1 : t = 1/\sqrt{N}$. Proposition 6.14 implies that the asymptotic local power is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\lambda\neq 0}\frac{c_\lambda(z,q)}{d_\lambda}X^\lambda > c_{1-\alpha}^{z,q}\right),$$

where X^λ is a non-central chi-square variable on d_λ^2 degrees of freedom with non-centrality parameter equal to $\sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\lambda}\left(\gamma_{ij}^\lambda\right)^2$ and $\{X^\lambda\}$ are mutually independent.

6.3. *Global asymptotic power function against local alternatives.* As shown in sections 3.2.3 and 4, the goodness-of-fit tests based on $T_z^{(N)}$ and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ are consistent in power against all fixed alternatives in the corresponding hypothesis testing problem. However, it is well-known that any test of goodness-of-fit is poor against local (contiguous) alternatives, except possibly in a finite number of directions. Roughly speaking, any test can obtain reasonable power locally against a family of distributions of a fixed finite dimension. This section investigates this phenomenon in the case of $T_z^{(N)}$ and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$.

6.3.1. *Spectral decomposition of the power function.* Consider the standard local hypothesis setup. Because of Proposition 6.5, one can focus on the limiting Gaussian shift experiment. This section consider the behavior of the power function under local departures from the null. For an arbitrary non-parametric unbiased test ϕ in a Gaussian shift experiment, Janssen [1995] has shown that the curvature of the power function admits a principal component decomposition. Focus on $T_z^{(N)}$ and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$; this will simplify the derivation. For more details and statements in full generality see Janssen [1995].

First consider the test based on $T_z^{(N)}$. Using the notation of section 6.2.1, for a Q.M.D. family of density functions $f(\cdot \mid \theta)$ with $\theta \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, the asymptotic power against the local alternative $H_1 : \theta = \theta_0 + h/\sqrt{N}$ is given by Proposition 6.10 as

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(h) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right),$$

where U_λ are independently distributed as non-central chi-square variables on one degree of freedom with non-centrality parameters equal to $(\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2$, respectively. The non-centrality parameters are defined through the Fourier expansion of the score function in the basis of irreducible characters. That is,

$$\eta(\cdot \mid \theta_0) = \sum_{\lambda} \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)\chi_\lambda(\cdot).$$

The rejection cutoff $c_{z,1-\alpha}$ is such that $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathbf{0}) = \alpha$. Janssen [1995] considers the second order Taylor expansion of $\boldsymbol{\beta}(th)$ around $t = 0$. This is straightforward in the case of T_z using the above representation of $\boldsymbol{\beta}(h)$. The following lemma of Beran [1975] is the key to deriving such an expansion.

LEMMA 6.16. *Let* $S(\boldsymbol{b}) = \sum_i \sigma_i^2 \chi_i^2(n_i, b_i^2)$, *where* $\boldsymbol{b} = \{b_i \mid i \geq 1\}$, $\sigma_1^2 \geq \sigma_2^2 \geq \cdots > 0$, $\sum n_i \sigma_i^2 < \infty$, $\sum b_i^2 \sigma_i^2 < \infty$, *and* $\{\chi_i^2(n_i, b_i^2) \mid i \geq 1\}$ *are independent non-central chi-square random variables with degrees of freedom equal to* n_i *and non-centrality parameter equal to* b_i^2. *Let* $G(x) = \mathbb{P}(S(\boldsymbol{b}) > x)$ *and*

$$G_{i_1,\ldots,i_k}(x) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_i \sigma_i^2 \chi_i^2 \left[n_i + 2\sum_{j=1}^{k} \delta(i_j, i)\right] > x\right),$$

where $\chi_i^2[\cdot]$ *are independent central chi-square variable with degrees of freedom equal to the argument. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S(\boldsymbol{b}) > x\right) = e^{-\sum_i b_i^2/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (2^k k!)^{-1} \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_k} b_{i_1}^2 b_{i_2}^2 \cdots b_{i_k}^2 G_{i_1,\ldots,i_k}(x), \tag{27}$$

the series converging uniformly in x *and uniformly over every set of the form* $\{\boldsymbol{b} \mid \sum_i b_i^2 \leq c\}$.

Using the Lemma 6.16 one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\beta}(t \cdot h) &= e^{-\sum_\lambda t^2 \cdot (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (2^k k!)^{-1} t^{2k} \sum_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_k} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k} (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda_j)^T h)^2\right) G_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_k}(c_{z,1-\alpha}) \\
&= (1 - \sum_\lambda t^2 \cdot (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2/2) \left(G(c_{z,1-\alpha}) + \frac{t^2}{2} \sum_\lambda (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2 G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha})\right) + o(t^2) \\
&= G(c_{z,1-\alpha}) + \frac{t^2}{2} \sum_\lambda (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2 \left[G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - G(c_{z,1-\alpha})\right] + o(t^2) \\
&= \alpha + \frac{t^2}{2} \sum_\lambda (\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2 \left[G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - \alpha\right] + o(t^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the curvature of the power function around $t = 0$ is

$$a(h) = \langle T(h), h \rangle,$$

for the positive-definite bi-linear operator

$$T = \sum_\lambda \left[G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - \alpha\right] \widehat{\eta}(\lambda) \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T.$$

This readily gives a principal decomposition of the curvature, with principal components $\{\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T\}$ and eigenvalues $G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - \alpha \geq 0$. For a fixed z

and α, $G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - \alpha$ is a decreasing function of $|\lambda|$. Thus, the highest gain in power is against those alternatives that put most of the load on principal components for smaller $|\lambda|$. More formally, since

$$\sum_\lambda \widehat{\eta}(\lambda)\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T = \mathcal{I}(\theta_0),$$

across the set of alternatives $\{h \mid h^T\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)h = c > 0\}$, T_z is more powerful against those with larger values of $(\widehat{\eta}(\lambda)^T h)^2$ for small values of $|\lambda|$. This is illustrated for the infinite-dimensional family of alternatives considered in Example 6.13.

EXAMPLE 6.17 (Example 6.13 continued). *For the exponential family*

$$f(x \mid \Theta) \propto e^{\sum_\lambda \theta_\lambda \chi_\lambda(x)}$$

with $\Theta = (\theta_\lambda)_\lambda \in \ell^2(\mathbb{R})$, *the local power is*

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(\Theta) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right),$$

where U_λ*'s are independent and distributed as a non-central chi-square on one degree of freedom with non-centrality parameter equal to* $(\theta_\lambda)^2$, *respectively. In particular, the following expansion holds around* $t = 0$*:*

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(t\Theta) = \alpha + \frac{t^2}{2}\sum_\lambda \theta_\lambda^2 \left[G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - \alpha\right] + o(t^2).$$

Therefore, the principal directions are $\{e_\lambda \mid \lambda\}$, *where* $e_\lambda \in \ell^2$ *is the vector with a one in the* λ*-th coordinate and zeros elsewhere. In other words, the principal directions correspond to the irreducible characters of* $SO(2n+1)$. *As a consequence, over the set of alternative* $\{\Theta \mid \|\Theta\|_2 = c > 0\}$, T_z *achieves its highest power against the alternative corresponding to* $\theta_{(1)} = c$ *and* $\theta_\lambda = 0$ *for* $\lambda \neq (1)$.

Theorem 2.1 in Janssen [1995] implies that T is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator and $\|T\|^2 < 2\alpha(1-\alpha)$. This implies that any test performs poor against all alternatives except for a finite dimensional space.

REMARK 6.18. *In the case of* T_z *one has*

$$\sum_\lambda \left[G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - \alpha\right]^2 < 2\alpha(1-\alpha).$$

Thus, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a positive integer k such that

$$\sum_{|\lambda|>k} \left[G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - \alpha\right]^2 < \epsilon.$$

This means that the rate of gain in power against local alternative in all directions is negligible except for possible finitely many directions. A more quantitative version of such a statement is provided in section 6.3.3.

The results stated above are all local around $t = 0$. They provide information about the rate of change in the power function for different directions of departure form the null for general non-parametric tests of goodness-of-fit. The test based on T_z has a especial structure that allows for further exploration of the ideas of this section. In particular, one can prove previous results globally rather than locally. This is presented below.

For a direction $\boldsymbol{h} = \{h_\lambda\}$, a $t > 0$, and a significance level α define

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}, t) = \mathbb{P}\left(T_z > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right),$$

where $T_z = \sum_{\lambda\neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} U_\lambda$ for independent non-central chi-square random variables U_λ each on one degree of freedom with non-centrality parameters equal to $(t^2 \cdot h_\lambda^2)$, respectively. The cutoff $c_{z,1-\alpha}$ is such that $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}, 0) = \alpha$. Let e_λ be the principal direction defined above. The following proposition formalizes the arguments above.

PROPOSITION 6.19. *The level α test based on T_z has the properties*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup\{\boldsymbol{\beta}(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}, t) \mid \|\boldsymbol{h}\| = 1\} = \boldsymbol{\beta}(\alpha, e_{(1)}, t),\\
&\boldsymbol{\beta}(\alpha, e_\lambda, t) \le \boldsymbol{\beta}(\alpha, e_\mu, t) \quad \textit{if} \quad |\lambda| \ge |\mu|,\\
&\lim_{|\lambda|\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\beta}(\alpha, e_\lambda, t) = \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

This proposition is analogous to that for the Cramer-von Mises test, presented in Neuhaus [1976, Theorem 2.2]. The proof is essentially the same and based on the following lemma; see Neuhaus [1976, Proposition 2.1].

LEMMA 6.20. *Let Z_1 and Z_2 be independent standard normal variables, $\sigma_1 \ge \sigma_2 > 0$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, and $c > 0$. Then,*

$$f(\phi) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_1^2(Z_1 - \rho\cos\phi)^2 + \sigma_2^2(Z_2 - \rho\sin\phi)^2 > c\right)$$

is monotonically non-increasing for $\phi \in [0, \pi/2]$. In other words, the random variables $\sigma_1^2(Z_1-\rho\cos\phi)^2+\sigma_2^2(Z_2-\rho\sin\phi)^2$ are stochastically non-increasing for $0 \le \phi \le \pi/2$.

REMARK 6.21. *An analogous investigation is possible for $U_{z,q}$ which we is not presented here due to similarity to the case of T_z. The only major difference is that unlike T_z for which the order of the weights $z^{|\lambda|}$ is clear, the weights $c(z,q)$ for $U_{z,q}$, given in (18), are hard to order. In fact, to the best of our knowledge, ordering of $s_\lambda(1,q,\dots,q^{n-1})$ are not known in the literature. However, the weights can be computed numerically for a relatively large number of partitions λ, yielding an ordering of the principal directions for $|\lambda|$ not too large.*

6.3.2. *Asymptotic relative efficiency.* Consider a hypothesis testing problem where two test statistics ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are available. Imagine deciding on which test to use taking into consideration various factors such as the computational cost. One needs a way of comparing performance of the two tests; a classical approach to this problem is through comparison of power functions. For a fixed $\beta \geq \alpha > 0$, let n_i be the sample size needed for the level-α test based on ϕ_i to achieve power β. Roughly speaking, the *Pitman relative efficiency* of the tests is defined as n_1/n_2. For instance, a ratio of 2 would indicate that the test based on ϕ_1 requires twice as many observations as required by ϕ_2 to achieve the same power at the same level. For two sequences of tests $\phi_1^{(n)}$ and $\phi_2^{(n)}$ the *asymptotic relative efficiency* (ARE) is the limit of the Pitman relative efficiency. That is,

$$\text{ARE} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{n_1^{(k)}}{n_2^{(k)}},$$

assuming that the limit exists. For a more formal treatment and basic properties see [Lehmann and Romano, 2006, Chapter 13].

In a local testing problem the ARE can be computed using the limiting experiments. Focus on the test based on T_z against a fixed alternative $\boldsymbol{h}$. A natural measure of efficiency of T_z in this testing problem is the ARE of T_z with respect to the optimal Neyman-Pearson test

$$\phi^* = \mathbf{1}\left(\left|\sum_\lambda h_\lambda Z_\lambda\right| > \|h\| u_{1-\alpha/2}\right),$$

where $u_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $1-\alpha/2$-quantile of the standard normal distribution. Following Neuhaus [1976], define $e(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}, t)$ as the solution e of

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}, t) = \boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{h}}(\alpha, t\sqrt{e}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is the power function of ϕ^*. Moreover, define the *local asymptotic relative efficiency* (ARE_L) as

$$e(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}) = \lim_{t\to 0} e(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}, t).$$

For a broad range of problems $e(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}, t)$ indeed equals the Pitman asymptotic efficiency. We only consider ARE_L; the results of this section allow for computation of ARE_L. In particular, it is clear that ARE_L is closely related to the curvature of the power function around $t = 0$. In fact, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ARE}_L(T_z, \boldsymbol{h}) &= \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{h}, T(\boldsymbol{h})\rangle}{\|\boldsymbol{h}\|^2 2 f(u_{1-\alpha/2}) u_{1-\alpha/2}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_\lambda h_\lambda^2 \left[G_\lambda(c_{z,1-\alpha}) - \alpha\right]}{\|\boldsymbol{h}\|^2 2 f(u_{1-\alpha/2}) u_{1-\alpha/2}},\end{aligned}$$

where f is the standard normal density; Janssen [1995, Section 3.2] derives this for a general test. The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Proposition 6.19.

COROLLARY 6.22. *Using the notation of this section, one has*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup\{e(\alpha, \boldsymbol{h}) \mid \|\boldsymbol{h}\| = 1\} = e(\alpha, e_{(1)}) \\ &e(\alpha, e_\lambda) \le e(\alpha, e_\mu) \quad \textit{if} \quad |\lambda| \ge |\mu| \\ &\lim_{|\lambda|\to\infty} e(\alpha, e_\lambda) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Similar results hold for $U_{z,q}$ but they are not presented here since the derivation is very similar.

6.3.3. *Dimension of the detectable subspace of alternatives.* Arguments of the previous sections suggest that every omnibus test essentially only uses a finite number of directions. Section 6.3.1 formalizes this phenomenon using the principal component decomposition of the curvature of the power function under infinitesimal departures from the null. This section briefly reviews another formulation of this phenomenon which has a global flavor. Janssen [2000] made the point clear that one can not expect to construct tests with high power, except possibly in a finite-dimensional subspace, by providing specific bounds on the dimension of the subspace. His main result is the following.

PROPOSITION 6.23 (Janssen [2000], Theorem 2.1). *Let ϕ be any test for the null hypothesis P_0 of the Gaussian shift $\boldsymbol{G}$ with $\mathbb{E}_{P_0}(\phi) = \alpha$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$. For each $\epsilon > 0$ and $K > 0$ there exists a finite dimensional linear subspace $V \subset \mathbb{H}$ with*

$$\sup\{|\mathbb{E}_{P_h}(\phi) - \alpha| : h \in V^\perp, \|h\| \le K\} \le \epsilon.$$

Moreover, the following upper bound

$$\dim V \leq 1 + \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)}{\epsilon}(e^{K^2} - 1)$$

holds independent of the test ϕ.

The proof relies on the following lemma.

LEMMA 6.24 (Janssen [2000], Lemma 2.1). *Let* $\{h_i\}_{i\in I}$ *be an orthonormal system in the parameter space* $\mathbb{H}$. *For each constant* $K > 0$, *one has*

$$\sum_{i\in I} (\sup\{|\mathbb{E}_{th_i}(\phi) - \alpha| : |t| \leq K\})^2 \leq \alpha(1-\alpha)(e^{K^2} - 1). \tag{28}$$

The left hand side of (28) can be written more explicitly in the case of T_z and $U_{z,q}$. Again focus on the case of T_z. Using the orthonormal basis $\{e_\lambda\}$ one has

$$\mathbb{E}_{te_\mu}(\phi) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\lambda\neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} X_\lambda^2 > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right),$$

where X_λ are independent standard normal variable except for $\lambda = \mu$. X_μ is a normal variable with mean t and variance one. In particular, the supremum in (28) is attained for $t = \pm K$ and the result reads as

$$\sum_{\lambda} \beta_\lambda(K)^2 \leq \alpha(1-\alpha)(e^{K^2} - 1),$$

where $\beta_\lambda(K)$ is the gain in power against direction e_λ. That is,

$$\beta_\lambda(K) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\mu\neq 0} z^{|\mu|} X_\mu^2 > c_{z,1-\alpha}\right) - \alpha,$$

where X_μ are independent standard normal variable except for $\mu = \lambda$. X_λ is a normal variable with mean K and variance one. The bound can be sharpened in the case of T_z using Lemma 6.16, but it does not contribute to conceptual consequences. The main conceptual consequence is that to test against shrinking alternatives one essentially needs to have a prior knowledge about the alternative, in order to build tests that have high power against it. In particular it, there remains the possibility that, for any fixed sample size, any test will perform poorly against a broad range of alternatives. Therefore, the results of non-parametric tests, when they found no significance, should be interpreted cautiously.

7. Other Compact Groups. The compact classical groups fall into four general classes:

1. *Type A:* $U(n)$ and $SL(n)$.
2. *Type B:* $SO(2n+1)$.
3. *Type C:* $Sp(2n)$.
4. *Type D:* $SO(2n)$.

For each type the analogous tests to $T_z^{(N)}$ and $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ are introduced in this section.

7.1. *The test based on the eigenvalues.* For the groups of type A, Coram and Diaconis [2003] introduced a test which inspired the test based on $T_z^{(N)}$ of the present paper. The case of type B groups ($SO(2n+1)$) was discussed in section 3.2.3. Type C and D are discussed below.

7.1.1. *Type C.* To construct a spectral test for the eigenvalue distribution on $Sp(2n)$, one needs an orthonormal basis for the space of function on $Sp(2n)$. A basis is given by the irreducible characters of the Lie group $Sp(2n)$. The irreducible representations of the symplectic group $Sp(2n)$ are labeled by partitions λ, of non-negative integers, with at most n parts (see Proposition 3.1.20 in Goodman and Wallach [2009, ch. 3]). Let χ_λ be the irreducible character corresponding to λ. Given independent observations $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in Sp(2n)$, define the Fourier coefficient corresponding to λ as

$$\widehat{\chi}_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \chi_\lambda(g_i).$$

For $0 < z < 1$ define the test statistics $T_{C,z}^{(N)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{C,z}^{(N)} &= N \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} \left|\widehat{\chi}_N(\lambda)\right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} K_z^C(g_i, g_j), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$K_z^C(g_i, g_j) \doteq \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} z^{|\lambda|} \chi_\lambda(g_i)\chi_\lambda(g_j).$$

A closed from for $K_z^C(g,h)$ can be found using the Cauchy identity for the symplectic group [Sepehri, Theorem 3.7] as follows:

$$K_z^C(g,h) = \frac{(1-z^2)^m \det\left(\frac{1}{(1-zx_iy_j)(1-zx_i^{-1}y_j)(1-zx_iy_j^{-1})(1-zx_i^{-1}y_j^{-1})}\right)}{z^{\binom{m}{2}}\prod_{i<j}\left(y_i+y_i^{-1}-(y_j+y_j^{-1})\right)\prod_{i<j}\left(x_i+x_i^{-1}-(x_j+x_j^{-1})\right)},$$

where $\{x_i^{\pm}\}$ and $\{y_i^{\pm}\}$ are eigenvalues of g and h respectively.

Derivation of the asymptotic null and alternative distributions, and local power are identical to those for $SO(2n+1)$, hence omitted here.

7.1.2. *Type D.* The case of $O(2n)$ is more complicated. A $g \in O(2n)$ with $\det g = 1$ has n pairs of conjugate eigenvalues of norm one. An orthogonal matrix $g \in O(2n)$ with $\det g = -1$ has an eigenvalue equal to 1, another one equal to -1, and $n-1$ pairs of conjugate eigenvalues of norm one. This asymmetry is an indication of the subtlety of the theory for $O(2n)$. Focus on the case of $\det g = 1$; that is, $g \in SO(2n)$. The irreducible representations of $SO(2n)$ are indexed by sequences of integers $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_n)$ and $\lambda^- = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_{n-1}, -\lambda_n)$, where λ is a partition with at most n parts of an arbitrary non-negative integer. The Weyl character formula is as follows. Let $x_1, x_1^{-1}, \ldots, x_n, x_n^{-1}$ are eigenvalues of $g \in SO(2n)$. If $\lambda_n = 0$, then

$$so_\lambda(g) = \frac{\det\left(x_i^{\lambda_j+n-j} + x_i^{-(\lambda_j+n-j)}\right)}{\det\left(x_i^{n-j} + x_i^{-(n-j)}\right)}. \tag{29}$$

If $\lambda_n > 0$, then the character of the irreducible representation corresponding to λ is given by

$$so_\lambda(g) = \frac{\det\left(x_i^{\lambda_j+n-j} + x_i^{-(\lambda_j+n-j)}\right) - \det\left(x_i^{\lambda_j+n-j} - x_i^{-(\lambda_j+n-j)}\right)}{2\det\left(x_i^{n-j} + x_i^{-(n-j)}\right)}, \tag{30}$$

and the one corresponding to λ^- is given as

$$so_{\lambda^-}(g) = \frac{\det\left(x_i^{\lambda_j+n-j} + x_i^{-(\lambda_j+n-j)}\right) + \det\left(x_i^{\lambda_j+n-j} - x_i^{-(\lambda_j+n-j)}\right)}{2\det\left(x_i^{n-j} + x_i^{-(n-j)}\right)}. \tag{31}$$

Define χ_λ as so_λ if $\lambda_n = 0$, and as $so_\lambda + so_{\lambda^-}$ if $\lambda_n > 0$. In fact, χ_λ is the restriction of the irreducible character of $O(2n)$ to $SO(2n)$; it is an

irreducible character of $SO(2n)$ if and only if $\lambda_n = 0$. The test analogous to $T_z^{(N)}$ is constructed in terms of $\{\chi_\lambda\}$.

For a partition λ with at most n parts define

$$\widehat{\chi}_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\chi_\lambda(g_i).$$

For $0 < z < 1$ define the test statistics $T_{D,z}^{(N)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{D,z}^{(N)} &= N\sum_{\lambda\neq 0} z^{|\lambda|}\,|\widehat{\chi}_N(\lambda)|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} K_z^D(g_i,g_j), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$K_z^D(g_i,g_j) \doteq \sum_{\lambda\neq 0} z^{|\lambda|}\chi_\lambda(g_i)\chi_\lambda(g_j),$$

where the sum is over all partitions of an arbitrary positive integer with at most n parts. A closed from for $K_z^D(g,h)$ is given by the Cauchy identity for $SO(2n)$ [Sepehri, Theorem 3.8] as follows:

$$K_z^D(g,h) = \frac{\det\left(\frac{1}{1-zx_iy_j} + \frac{1}{1-zx_i^{-1}y_j} + \frac{1}{1-zx_iy_j^{-1}} + \frac{1}{1-zx_i^{-1}y_j^{-1}}\right)}{z^{\binom{m}{2}}\prod_{i<j}\left(y_i + y_i^{-1} - (y_j + y_j^{-1})\right)\prod_{i<j}\left(x_i + x_i^{-1} - (x_j + x_j^{-1})\right)},$$

where $\{x_i^{\pm}\}$ and $\{y_i^{\pm}\}$ are eigenvalues of g and h respectively.

Derivation of the asymptotic null and alternative distributions, and local power are identical to those for $SO(2n+1)$, hence omitted here.

7.2. *The test beyond the eigenvalues.* A test similar to $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$ can be constructed for all compact groups. With abuse of notation, these tests all are denoted by $U_{z,q}^{(N)}$. The case of $SO(2n+1)$ is already discussed in section 4. The other cases are considered in this section.

7.2.1. *Type A.* The irreducible representations of the unitary group $U(n)$ are labeled by the partitions λ of arbitrary non-negative integers with at most n parts. For a partition λ let π^λ be the irreducible representation corresponding to λ and χ_λ the corresponding character. Given independent

observations $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in U(n)$, define the Fourier component corresponding to λ as

$$\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi^{\lambda}(g_i).$$

The test statistic is defined through

$$U_{z,q}^{(N)} = N \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} c_\lambda(z,q) \|\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)\|_F^2,$$

where $c_\lambda(z,q)$ is defined in (18). The Cauchy identity provides a closed form expression. The Cauchy identity reads

$$\sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda(x)\chi_\lambda(g) = \prod_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1 - x_i y_j},$$

where s_λ is the Schur function in the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, and $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are the eigenvalues of g. In fact, Schur functions computed at the eigenvalues coincide with the characters of the unitary group; but, two different symbols are used above to distinguish different roles of the two functions. Setting $x_i = zq^{i-1}$, one has

$$\sum_{\lambda} c_\lambda(z,q)\chi_\lambda(g) = \prod_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1 - zq^{j-1} y_i},$$

because of (16) and (18).

Expanding the norm square, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} U_{z,q}^{(N)} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} c\lambda(z,q)\chi_\lambda(g_i^* g_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \left(\prod_{l,k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1 - zq^{l-1} y_k^{i,j}} - 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $y_1^{i,j}, \ldots, y_n^{i,j}$ are the eigenvalues of $g_i^* g_j$.

Derivation of the asymptotic null and alternative distributions is identical to those in section 4.1 and are omitted here.

7.2.2. *Type C.* The irreducible representations of the symplectic group $Sp(2n)$ are labeled by the partitions λ of arbitrary non-negative integers with at most n parts. For a partition λ let π^λ be the irreducible representation corresponding to λ and χ_λ the corresponding character. Given independent observations $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in Sp(2n)$, define the Fourier component corresponding to λ as

$$\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi^\lambda(g_i).$$

The test statistic is defined through

$$U_{z,q}^{(N)} = N \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} c_\lambda(z,q) \|\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)\|_F^2,$$

where $c_\lambda(z,q)$ is defined in (18). The Cauchy-Littlewood identity provides a closed form expression.

PROPOSITION 7.1 (The Cauchy-Littlewood identity Weyl [1946], Section 7.8). *Let χ_λ be the irreducible character of $G = Sp(2n)$ and s_λ the Schur function of symmetric function theory. Let $g \in G$ with eigenvalues $y_1^{\pm}, \ldots, y_n^{\pm}$. Then,*

$$\sum_\lambda s_\lambda(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\chi_\lambda(g) = \frac{\prod_{k<j}(1 - x_k x_j)}{\prod_{k,j}(1 - x_k y_j)(1 - x_k y_j^{-1})}. \tag{32}$$

Setting $x_i = zq^{i-1}$, one has

$$\sum_\lambda c_\lambda(z,q)\chi_\lambda(g) = \frac{\prod_{i<j}(1 - z^2 q^{i+j-2})}{\prod_{i,j}(1 - zq^{i-1}y_j)(1 - zq^{i-1}y_j^{-1})},$$

because of (16) and (18). Therefore, one has the following closed form definition

$$U_{z,q}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,l=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\prod_{i<j}(1 - z^2 q^{i+j-2})}{\prod_{i,j}(1 - zq^{i-1}y_j^{k,l})(1 - zq^{i-1}(y_j^{k,l})^{-1})} - 1 \right),$$

where $\{y_j^{k,l}, (y_j^{k,l})^{-1} \mid j = 1, \ldots, n\}$ are the eigenvalues of $g_k g_l^T$.

Derivation of the asymptotic null and alternative distributions is identical to those in section 4.1 and are omitted here.

7.2.3. *Type D.* The case of $SO(2n)$ is more subtle. Let λ be a partition of an arbitrary non-negative integer with at most n parts, π^λ the irreducible representation of $O(2n)$ (not $SO(2n)$) corresponding to λ, and χ_λ the corresponding character as defined in section 7.1.2. Given independent observations $g_1, \ldots, g_N \in SO(2n)$, define the Fourier component corresponding to λ as

$$\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi^\lambda(g_i).$$

The test statistic is defined through

$$U_{z,q}^{(N)} = N \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} c_\lambda(z,q) \|\widehat{\pi}_N(\lambda)\|_F^2,$$

where $c_\lambda(z,q)$ is defined in (18). The Cauchy-Littlewood identity provides a closed form expression.

PROPOSITION 7.2 (The Cauchy-Littlewood identity Weyl [1946], Section 7.9). *Let $g \in SO(2n)$ with eigenvalues $y_1^\pm, \ldots, y_n^\pm$. For χ_λ defined in section 7.1.2 and s_λ the Schur function, one has*

$$\sum_\lambda s_\lambda(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\chi_\lambda(g) = \frac{\prod_{k \leq j}(1 - x_k x_j)}{\prod_{k,j}(1 - x_k y_j)(1 - x_k y_j^{-1})}, \tag{33}$$

where the sum is over all partitions with at most n parts of arbitrary non-negative integers.

Setting $x_i = zq^{i-1}$, one has

$$\sum_\lambda c_\lambda(z,q)\chi_\lambda(g) = \frac{\prod_{i \leq j}(1 - z^2 q^{i+j-2})}{\prod_{i,j}(1 - zq^{i-1} y_j)(1 - zq^{i-1} y_j^{-1})},$$

because of (16) and (18). Therefore, one has the following closed form definition

$$U_{z,q}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,l=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\prod_{i \leq j}(1 - z^2 q^{i+j-2})}{\prod_{i,j}(1 - zq^{i-1} y_j^{k,l})(1 - zq^{i-1}(y_j^{k,l})^{-1})} - 1 \right),$$

where $\{y_j^{k,l}, (y_j^{k,l})^{-1} \mid j = 1, \ldots, n\}$ are the eigenvalues of $g_k g_l^T$.

Derivation of the asymptotic null and alternative distributions is identical to those in section 4.1 and are omitted here.

8. Discussion. The current paper introduces and analyzes two new families of tests for uniformity on the compact classical groups. These tests are validated on two benchmark examples: the random walk of Kac and the products of random reflections. They exhibit satisfying agreement with the existing theory about the mixing-time of both wandom walks. The new tests, and several others, are applied to the new sampler of Jones et al. [2011]; all but one of the new tests failed to reject the null hypothesis of uniformity after any number of iterations of the new sampler. One of the new tests provided evidence for departure from uniformity for one and two iterations of the new sampler (in $n = 51$ dimensions) and did not reject the null hypothesis beyond two iterations of the sampler. This agrees with the prescribed number of steps to be used with the sampler in order to get approximately uniform outputs.

9. Acknowledgments. I am greatly indebted to my doctoral advisor, Persi Diaconis, for suggesting the problem and his continuing guidance and support. I thank Daniel Bump for discussions on representation theory; Arun Ram for sharing his notes on the character theory and symmetric function theory; Sourav Chatterjee and David Siegmund for helpful comments and discussions; Matan Gavish for sharing his course report on numerical investigation of the mixing-time for a Markov chain sampler on the unitary group.

References.

Milton Abramowitz and Irene A Stegun. *Handbook of mathematical functions: with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*, volume 55. Courier Corporation, 1964.

Björn Ajne. A simple test for uniformity of a circular distribution. *Biometrika*, 55(2): 343–354, 1968.

George E Andrews. *The theory of partitions*. Number 2. Cambridge university press, 1998.

David Applebaum and Herbert Heyer. *Probability on compact Lie groups*, volume 70. Springer, 2014.

Ery Arias-Castro, Bruno Pelletier, and Venkatesh Saligrama. Remember the curse of dimensionality: The case of goodness-of-fit testing in arbitrary dimension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.08156*, 2016.

Ludwig Baringhaus. Testing for spherical symmetry of a multivariate distribution. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 899–917, 1991.

Rudolf Beran. Testing for uniformity on a compact homogeneous space. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 5(1):177–195, 1968.

Rudolf Beran. Tail probabilities of noncentral quadratic forms. *The Annals of Statistics*, 3(4):969–974, 1975.

Allan Birnbaum. Characterizations of complete classes of tests of some multiparametric hypotheses, with applications to likelihood ratio tests. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 21–36, 1955.

Theodor Bröcker and Tammo tom Dieck. Elementary representation theory. In *Representations of Compact Lie Groups*, pages 64–122. Springer, 1985.

Daniel Bump. *Lie groups*. Springer, 2004.

Marc Coram and Persi Diaconis. New tests of the correspondence between unitary eigenvalues and the zeros of riemann's zeta function. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 36(12):2883, 2003.

P Diaconis and C Mallows. On the trace of random orthogonal matrices. *Unpublished manuscript. Results summarized in Diaconis (1990)*, 1986.

Persi Diaconis. Application of the method of moments in probability and statistics. *Moments in mathematics*, 125:142, 1987.

Persi Diaconis. Patterns in eigenvalues: the 70th josiah willard gibbs lecture. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 40(2):155–178, 2003.

Persi Diaconis and Peter J Forrester. A. hurwitz and the origins of random matrix theory in mathematics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.09229*, 2015.

Persi Diaconis and Mehrdad Shahshahani. Products of random matrices as they arise in the study of random walks on groups. *Contemp. Math*, 50:183–195, 1986.

Persi Diaconis and Mehrdad Shahshahani. The subgroup algorithm for generating uniform random variables. *Probability in the engineering and informational sciences*, 1(01):15–32, 1987.

Thomas D Downs. Orientation statistics. *Biometrika*, 59(3):665–676, 1972.

Evarist M Giné. The addition formula for the eigenfunctions of the laplacian. *Advances in Mathematics*, 18(1):102–107, 1975a.

Evarist M Giné. Invariant tests for uniformity on compact riemannian manifolds based on sobolev norms. *The Annals of statistics*, pages 1243–1266, 1975b.

Roe Goodman and Nolan R Wallach. *Symmetry, representations, and invariants*, volume 66. Springer, 2009.

W Keith Hastings. Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, 57(1):97–109, 1970.

M Hermans and JP Rasson. A new sobolev test for uniformity on the circle. *Biometrika*, 72(3):698–702, 1985.

Adolf Hurwitz. Ueber die erzeugung der invarianten durch integration. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, 1897:71–2, 1897.

Arnold Janssen. Principal component decomposition of non-parametric tests. *Probability theory and related fields*, 101(2):193–209, 1995.

Arnold Janssen. Global power functions of goodness of fit tests. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 239–253, 2000.

Peter W Jones, Andrei Osipov, and Vladimir Rokhlin. Randomized approximate nearest neighbors algorithm. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(38):15679–15686, 2011.

PE Jupp and BD Spurr. Sobolev tests for symmetry of directional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1225–1231, 1983.

PE Jupp and BD Spurr. Sobolev tests for independence of directions. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1140–1155, 1985.

Mark Kac. *Probability and related topics in physical sciences*, volume 1. American Mathematical Soc., 1959.

Peter T Kim. Deconvolution density estimation on so (n). *The annals of statistics*, 26(3): 1083–1102, 1998.

Lucien Le Cam. *Asymptotic methods in statistical decision theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

Erich L Lehmann and Joseph P Romano. *Testing statistical hypotheses*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

Thierry Lévy. Schur–weyl duality and the heat kernel measure on the unitary group. *Advances in Mathematics*, 218(2):537–575, 2008.

Dudley Ernest Littlewood. *The theory of group characters and matrix representations of groups*, volume 357. American Mathematical Soc., 1950.

Ian G Macdonald. *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, volume 354. Clarendon press Oxford, 1995.

KV Mardia and PE Jupp. Directional statistics, 2000.

Madan Lal Mehta. *Random matrices*, volume 142. Academic press, 2004.

Georg Neuhaus. Asymptotic power properties of the cramér-von mises test under contiguous alternatives. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 6(1):95–110, 1976.

Roberto I Oliveira. On the convergence to equilibrium of kac's random walk on matrices. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 1200–1231, 2009.

GI Olshanski and AA Osinenko. Multivariate jacobi polynomials and the selberg integral. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, 46(4):262–278, 2012.

Igor Pak and Sergiy Sidenko. Convergence of kacs random walk. *Preprint available from http://www-math. mit. edu/˜ pak/research. html*, 2007.

Natesh S Pillai and Aaron Smith. On the mixing time of kac's walk and other high-dimensional gibbs samplers with constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08122*, 2016.

Ursula Porod. The cut-off phenomenon for random reflections. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(1):74–96, 1996.

MJ Prentice. On invariant tests of uniformity for directions and orientations. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 169–176, 1978.

Lord Rayleigh. Xii. on the resultant of a large number of vibrations of the same pitch and of arbitrary phase. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 10(60):73–78, 1880.

Jeffrey S Rosenthal. Random rotations: characters and random walks on so (n). *The Annals of Probability*, pages 398–423, 1994.

Ashis Sengupta and Chandranath Pal. On optimal tests for isotropy against the symmetric wrapped stable-circular uniform mixture family. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 28(1): 129–143, 2001.

Amir Sepehri. Cauchy identities for the characters of the compact classical groups. *arXiv:1610.04659*.

Helmut Strasser. *Mathematical theory of statistics: statistical experiments and asymptotic decision theory*, volume 7. Walter de Gruyter, 1985.

Geoffrey S Watson. Goodness-of-fit tests on a circle. *Biometrika*, 48(1/2):109–114, 1961.

Geoffrey S Watson. Goodness-of-fit tests on a circle. ii. *Biometrika*, 49(1/2):57–63, 1962.

Geoffrey S Watson. Another test for the uniformity of a circular distribution. *Biometrika*, 54(3-4):675–677, 1967.

Jon A Wellner. Permutation tests for directional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 929–943, 1979.

Hermann Weyl. *The Classical Groups, Their Invariants and Representations, by Hermann Weyl,...[with Supplement.]*. Princeton University Press, 1946.

Department of Statistics
Sequoia Hall, Stanford, CA 94305, USA
E-mail: asepehri@stanford.edu